

the country at large to enter a State for the mitigation of any pest which is a menace to the Nation at large. It should lie, I think, well within the constitutional power of the General Government to take the proper steps in any State in order to mitigate such a pest. Inasmuch as migratory birds do destroy such pests, without cost to the Government, I do not see why legislation for their protection should be more subject to constitutional restrictions than would be the sending of an employee of the Government, whose expenses the Government has to pay, into the same State for identically the same general purpose, though it may be in the pursuit of a different type of pest.

It seems to me that every argument would be in favor of the protection of the birds. They do the work of destroying insects without cost to anyone and to the benefit of people living in adjoining States as well.

If you permit migratory birds in the spring season to be killed in certain favorable localities while they are en route to their nesting grounds, they are placed at a great disadvantage. There are certain strategic points or passways where, if they are allowed to be killed, it will not be long before they will become exterminated. The wild pigeon of the South, and of the East for that matter, has in this way been exterminated. In my section of the country they have exterminated the great bulk not only of the migratory birds but of larger game in this manner.

I remember in the winter of 1881 there came out of the Rogue River Valley 10,000 deer hides, which sold on the market for 50 cents each. Those deer were killed for their hides. I have hunted in the mountains and have seen the carcasses of deer left there to rot. They were killed for their hides, worth 50 cents apiece, by hide hunters. The elk which ranged along the coast of Oregon formerly could be sometimes found in bands of 500 or 600. An elk will weigh as much as a thousand pounds. They were practically exterminated for their hides at 50 cents apiece. I do not know of a hundred in all to be found in the State. I know of but one little band up in the mountains of probably a dozen left on the old ground where I used to hunt. Some men will kill them for a tooth to wear for a watch charm.

The geese and ducks in our country in the early days along the Columbia River flats near Portland were countless in numbers, but now they are very scarce. They are protecting them now; they are feeding them; they are actually putting out food for them in order to attract them there. So it has been all through our country with every kind of game, fish, and fowl which were there in countless thousands in the early days. Of course, they had to retreat from civilization, and that was proper; but the needless slaughter of them, in my opinion, is a great wrong; it is a crime against nature. No man knows nor can he foretell what the harm, the damage, will be to the future of the country. It disturbs the balance of nature, and I do not see for the life of me how it can be any more unconstitutional for the Government to say that these wild creatures, which destroy pests and are a benefit to the country, shall be protected for that reason, than it is to send a man into the same State—as we have a perfect right to do—to kill insects of various kinds in other ways. I do not understand any such fine distinction, and I do not believe that if one is constitutional the other is unconstitutional.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, I shall not take issue with Senators. These two cases, so far as the law is concerned, may be on all fours with each other, but here is the difference: My purpose in opposing a large appropriation in this bill in connection with the enforcement of the migratory bird act is on account of the necessary machinery which would have to be furnished by the National Government under the civil-service law, although at some time near at hand its constitutionality might be questioned and decided in the courts. A large expenditure would be placed upon the Government, even before the act could be tested, if we should undertake to go into every State and place civil-service appointees there. Consequently, as I have already stated, I think we should have only a small appropriation for this work if there is to be any appropriation at all.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES, BROOKLYN NAVY YARD.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, we are advised that the funeral ship, the U. S. S. *Montana*, bearing the bodies of the American marines who lost their lives in the conflict of arms at Vera Cruz, will reach our shores on Monday. I am sure that it is the universal sentiment of the Senate that its Members will deem it a mournful pleasure to testify their respect for the memory of these heroic men by having this body stand adjourned on the occasion of the arrival of this ship on her sad mission. I therefore move that when the Sen-

ate adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to a point of no quorum. This is a very important subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I myself rose for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shively
Brandeggee	Gronna	Norris	Simmons
Burleigh	Johnson	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Burton	Jones	Page	Stone
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Perkins	Stout
Chilton	Lane	Robinson	Tillman
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Warren
Dillingham	Lewis	Sheppard	Weeks
Gallinger	McLean	Sherman	West

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 12, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 9, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of life and love, we pour out our hearts in gratitude to Thee for all the sweet and tender affections of the home, the sanctity of which is Mother; a name which challenges the respect of all, inspires the fondest recollections, and awakens the deepest reverence. In her, patience knows no bounds; in her, is sacrifice personified; in her, faith finds its highest expression; in her, hope burns brightest; in her, religion never fails; in her, the love of heaven is reflected. No language can express the heroism, power, and beauty of a mother's devotion; and the nation that holds sacred the charm of motherhood will not fail in its quest for righteousness, truth, justice, mercy, liberty. So long as she lives in the heart of the Nation, so long will it live. We thank Thee that our Republic has set apart a day sacred to her memory. God bless our mother. May she ever be an inspiration to nobler life and purer living for all the world. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 13770. An act to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest and Yosemite National Park, Cal.;

H. R. 12291. An act to increase the limit of cost for the extension, remodeling, and improvement of the Pensacola, Fla., post office and courthouse, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes.

W. HENRY PULLIAM.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House briefly concerning the first Virginian who died at Vera Cruz.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, It becomes my sad duty to announce to the Congress the death of W. Henry Pulliam, the first Virginian to offer his life for his country in the hostilities with Mexico. He was a constituent of mine, and comes from the sturdy stock of the people of our Commonwealth, who have been

ready at all times to offer themselves in the defense of their homes and their country. His death causes universal sorrow in the district in which he lived, and I insert an article from the Southwest Times, which voices the sentiments of his people regarding the great and patriotic sacrifice that he has made.

The article is as follows:

"A SON OF PULASKI FIRST VIRGINIAN TO DIE AT VERA CRUZ—W. HENRY PULLIAM, WHO WAS WOUNDED AT AMERICAN OCCUPATION OF MEXICAN CITY, DIED TUESDAY—MESSAGE LATE YESTERDAY AFTERNOON—BODY WILL BE BROUGHT HOME FOR INTERMENT.

"W. Henry Pulliam, a Pulaskian, was the first Virginian whose life was sacrificed in the hostilities with Mexico. Wounded ashore at Vera Cruz on April 22, the young man lingered until yesterday (Tuesday) morning at 8 o'clock, when he suddenly died as a result of his wounds received in the engagement in the taking of that port by the American marines. As briefly stated in yesterday's Times, a message was received by his father, Mr. George W. Pulliam, stating that the young man was dead, the message being received here at 3.17 in the afternoon.

"The news of Mr. Pulliam's death was received by the Navy Department at Washington from Admiral Badger. The same was conveyed to Pulaski through Secretary of the Navy Daniels in the following message:

"It is with the deepest regret that the department has received information from the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet that your son, Mr. Henry Pulliam, fireman first class, died suddenly Tuesday, May 5, 8 a. m. I extend to you my deepest sympathy in the loss of your son. His heroic courage gives him a place among our country's patriotic defenders.

"Please telegraph if you wish the remains sent home.

"In response to the message the grief-stricken father wired the department to send the remains home, and asked to be advised when they could be expected to reach here. When the body reaches home it will be received in a manner fitting that of a hero who gave his life in the honorable discharge of the duties which his country called upon him to do. The interment will be attended with honors fitting the true American soldier who has given his life in the defense of his country, details of which will be announced later.

"The deceased died rather suddenly, as expressed in the message received. As the messages of his condition were received by his father from time to time the seriousness of the young sailor's condition was indicated. Relatives had thus been prepared for the sad tidings. The gunshot wound which cost him his life penetrated his chest, abdomen, and spinal column and caused paralysis in the lower part of his body. Had he survived his wounds, it is probable he would have been helplessly crippled for life. From the nature of the wound it appeared that he had been fired on from above.

"William Henry Pulliam was the son of Mr. George Pulliam, of this place, his father coming here from Carroll County, and is now an employee of the General Chemical Co., with which several of the brothers are also connected. He was born about 32 years ago on Maple Street, in the residence now occupied by Dexter Ratcliffe. He was a splendid type of American manhood, a picture of robust health from among the mountains of southwest Virginia. He was one of the eight children—two sisters, Mrs. M. E. Shelton, of Roanoke, and Mrs. C. W. French, of Front Royal, Va.; and five brothers, Joseph, Charles, Robert, and Walter Pulliam, of Pulaski, and George Pulliam, of Providence, R. I. A younger sister died some months ago at Front Royal while visiting her sister. His mother is also dead. He visited home the last time last spring, when he returned to his duties aboard ship after spending his furlough here among home folks.

"He was serving the fourth year of his enlistment in the Navy, and his time would have expired early next year had he lived to that time. He was a fireman of the first class on the battleship *Utah*. He had risen through his integrity and general ability and attention to duty to the first line on his ship, and his record was a good one, as borne out by the brave spirit with which he met his death. He was fond of the life and would doubtless have reenlisted had he lived, for sea life seemed to have a fascination for him. He met his death in the brave discharge of his duties, and Pulaski, his home town, with his country, will pay the tribute to which he is justly entitled as her citizens gather about the grave which will receive his body when it was returned to his native home to rest."

FRANK DEVORICK.

Mr. VOLLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes about an Iowa seaman who was killed at Vera Cruz.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to address the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLLMER. Mr. Speaker, he was only an Iowa boy! His humble home stood on the rolling prairie, amid the waving cornfields of that State. The son of a poor immigrant, his name, Frank Devorick, may sound strange, harsh, foreign, to those who pride themselves on the untainted blue blood of ancient native lineage. But he was an American, and nowhere does the spirit of true Americanism boom with more of its original luster and native intensity than among the descendants of the immigrant in our Middle West. Particularly is this true in the great farming State of Iowa, where the public school has opened the doors of the mind to higher thoughts and nobler aspirations for a greater percentage of the people, as determined by the statistics of literacy, than in any other State in the Union. There, in the heart of the continent, 1,200 miles from the seaboard, the ambitious boy dreams over his schoolbooks of the far-away billowy ocean, "boundless, endless, and sublime," and of some day sailing across it under the flag of his country, the emblem of the highest civilization the world has ever seen. This Government, to his unspoiled mind, is a great beneficent power, whose citizens are sovereign, self-governing free men. His unsophisticated views have not been formed in the debasing environment of one of our great cities, with their machine systems of political control, where the omnipotent boss gives the lie to democratic pretensions and the people lose their faith in republican institutions. But out there on the prairie they still have the original notion of the thing, pure and undefiled, and hence whenever the country calls, they respond joyously with the flower of their young chivalry. There you will find the splendid brain and brawn, pulsing with love of country, so pure and so powerful as to raise ordinary men of common clay to the spiritual heights of consecration.

When the day of wrath shall come and the teachings of the fathers shall seem all but submerged under the engulfing tide of socialism and anarchism; when the mob of great metropolises, the Huns and Vandals of the future, shall lay iconoclastic hands on the pillars of the established order; when American patriotism shall seem dead under the assaults of Utopian visionaries who despise and condemn love of native land, you will find out on the farms of the Middle West the reserve supply of the Republic. [Applause.] Thus we find this Iowa boy, who never saw the army of the discontented trailing after the red rag of revolution, enlisting wholeheartedly under the beautiful starry banner of his country, whose every fluttering fold speaks to him of liberty and glory as no other flag on earth can speak, and gladly offering his young life for it—one of the first to make the sacrifice—far from his prairie home, on the burning sands of the palm-fringed shores of the Spanish Main at ancient Vera Cruz. But when I think of this boy dying down there, Mr. Speaker, though I honor and have attempted to pay a feeble tribute to the glory of the sacrifice, I can not help saying that I wish that Mexico were in hell rather than that hell in Mexico should continue to take from us an increasing toll of such precious young lives. As for the humble name of Frank Devorick, it takes its place among the names of American heroes forever enshrined in the Valhalla of a grateful Nation. [Applause.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARNHART. I have three privileged resolutions that I would like to submit this morning, because those interested in them are present, and I ask unanimous consent that whatever time is taken in the consideration of these resolutions may be added to the time for general debate on the pending pension appropriation bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I will ask unanimous consent that the time consumed before we go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall be added to the time allowed yesterday for general debate on the pension appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. This time will not be taken out of the time for general debate.

Mr. MANN. But the time was limited to a certain hour.

Mr. BARTLETT. The order is that general debate shall close at 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was under the impression that the order was for so many hours. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that whatever time is consumed before we go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the pension bill shall be added to the time, so that the general debate may be extended that much longer after 4 o'clock.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, is the extension of time to start from this moment?

The SPEAKER. No; it is to be considered as having begun at 12 o'clock to-day. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES, BROOKLYN NAVY YARD, NEW YORK.

The SPEAKER announced as the committee on the part of the House to attend the exercises to be held at the navy yard in Brooklyn, N. Y., on Monday, May 11, 1914, in honor of the men of the Navy and Marine Corps who lost their lives at Vera Cruz, Mexico, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MAHER, Mr. CALDER, Mr. LOGUE, Mr. GREENE of Vermont, Mr. THACHER, Mr. DEITRICK, Mr. SABATH, Mr. DALE, Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DUPRE, Mr. GOLDFOGLE, Mr. WITHERSPOON, Mr. DOOLING, Mr. SLEMP, Mr. GRIFFIN, and Mr. VOLLMER, with the understanding that if Mr. WALKER does not reach Washington in time to go, Mr. BARTLETT shall take his place on the committee.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 489 (H. Rept. 647).

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document 1,000 copies of revised hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Pensions having under consideration various bills introduced and referred to the said committee for the purpose of pensioning the survivors of the Indian wars that occurred after the late Civil War.

Mr. MANN. I make this suggestion to the gentleman: This resolution provides that there shall be printed as a House document 1,000 copies. The ordering of anything printed as a House document carries with it the printing of 1,300 and odd copies. I suppose what the gentleman wants is 1,000 extra copies for the use of the committee, or the Members.

Mr. BARNHART. We talked that over, and the gentleman who submitted the resolution [Mr. KEATING] was entirely satisfied to take 1,000 copies.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but he will not get 1,000 copies. The printing of a House document means, I think, that the House gets 300 copies, the Senate 200 copies—I do not remember the exact number—and that the remainder go to the depositories scattered throughout the country, a certain number to the departments, and so forth.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee fully realized that at the time we considered the resolution; but this is simply to include something which was omitted from the print of the hearing.

Mr. MANN. I understand. Why not print it as a House document, and print 1,000 additional copies?

Mr. BARNHART. The purpose of reprinting the matter was that it affects very largely the soldiery of the West who fought in several Indian wars. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HOWELL] had some remarks to submit to the committee, but at the time of the hearings he was absent and did not return until the hearings were closed. What he wanted to say and has submitted is of importance to the committee and to the country generally, and the committee has asked for a reprint, which they could not have except by a simple resolution, and the cost will amount to \$19.50.

The SPEAKER. Does either the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from Indiana wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out "1,000 copies of" and insert the word "the," and add to the resolution the following: "One thousand additional copies for the use of the House."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the resolution, page 1, line 2, by striking out "1,000 copies of" and insert the word "the," and add to the resolution the following: "One thousand additional copies for the use of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MILITARY POLICY OF UNITED STATES IN MEXICAN WAR.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution and ask for its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 493 (H. Rept. 648).

Resolved, That there be reprinted as a separate document, for the use of the House of Representatives, 3,000 copies of chapter 15 of the Military Policy of the United States, by Gen. Emory Upton, entitled "The Military Policy of the United States during the Mexican War," being pages 195 to 222, inclusive, of Senate Document No. 494, Sixty-second Congress, second session; 1,000 copies of the same to be distributed through the folding room of the House and 2,000 copies through the document room of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. BARNHART. This refers to some comments on our military policy in the old Mexican War.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is supposed to be its present value?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of the resolution. It proposes to reprint a chapter from a public document entitled "The Military Policy of the United States," by Maj. Gen. Emory Upton, a distinguished officer of the Civil War, and the author of "Upton's Tactics." After the close of the war he made a trip around the world to study the military systems of Europe and Asia. The document from which this chapter is to be reprinted is considered by all military authorities to be one of the greatest works ever issued on the subject of American military history. Unfortunately the general died before he could complete the chapters relating to the last two years of the Civil War. The entire work should be studied by every Member of Congress, because it treats of our wars from a totally different viewpoint than that of the ordinary historian.

The particular chapter that I desire to have printed deals with the Mexican War. It gives the instructions to the military commanders prior to the war and other interesting details. It gives a summary of the military legislation passed by Congress during the war and the effect of that legislation. It shows the evil of short enlistments. An act of Congress provided for enlistments for 12 months, and the result was that when Gen. Scott arrived about halfway between Vera Cruz and the City of Mexico terms of service of about 4,000 of his men expired, and he had to wait a solid year until new troops were recruited and sent to him before it was possible to capture Mexico City. I am sure that every Member of the House will read this extract with great interest. I must confess that the first time I read it I found the entire work more interesting than any novel.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman thinks that this special chapter may be of special value in the present situation?

Mr. HAYDEN. We can only judge the future by the past.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DRAINAGE SURVEY, RED LAKE RESERVATION.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.
The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 481 (H. Rept. 646).

Whereas Congress by act approved June 30, 1913, authorized a drainage survey of the diminished Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota to be made, together with an estimate of the cost of such drainage project; and

Whereas such survey and estimate has been made by the Department of the Interior and a report thereon prepared: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the report of said survey, with illustrations, be printed as a public document, and that 500 additional copies be printed for the use of the House document room.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that it be printed as a House document and not a public document.

Mr. BARNHART. If it were printed as a house document it would make a saving of 1,351 copies.

Mr. MANN. It will be entitled a House document.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the word "public" and insert the word "House."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How was this survey made, under what authority?

Mr. BARNHART. Under the authority of the Government.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Why is it not printed by the Interior Department?

Mr. BARNHART. I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. It never has been printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why does the department not print it?

Mr. BARNHART. I do not understand why.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why should the congressional allotment for printing be charged with the expense of printing for the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MANN. Because the House Members want it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The fact is we are having complaints about the cost of printing. The gentleman from Indiana, chairman of the Committee on Printing, brings in this resolution putting the cost of departmental printing on the congressional allotment. There will be no end to it.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that sometimes, where an investigation is made and the department does not care to have it printed for their use and Members of the House desire them for their use, Congress should print it. In this case the gentleman from Minnesota has a live matter before the House, and he wants this document in connection with it for the use of the Members of the House. There are a lot of these drainage propositions before Congress, and this document is for the benefit

of the Members of the House, for all of the Members of the House interested in the proposition.

Mr. BARNHART. The Committee on Printing tries to check these matters. In this case there is a demand for the publication. The expense of the survey has been incurred and the result of it is a matter of general importance and a matter of public benefit. The cost of the item is \$135.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Department of the Interior gets nearly half a million dollars for printing every year. Because some Member of Congress has an interest in some particular document it will not print the result of its investigations out of its own appropriation, but will leave it to the resource and activity of the various Members of Congress interested in the matter to get the printing done at the expense of the allotment for printing for Congress. In that way our printing expenses increase very largely, and the department augments its appropriation by unburdening its work at our expense.

Mr. BARNHART. I fully appreciate the statement of the gentleman from New York, but there are exceptions. If the gentleman from New York will be on hand when the general printing revision bill is up—

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the time to stop it is now, not when that bill is up, because there is not much prospect of that bill coming up.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that this appropriation ought to be stopped. I think it is a perfectly just request or I would not have reported it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why not make the Department of the Interior pay for it?

Mr. BARNHART. The Department of the Interior said it could not furnish them when I inquired of them, and I had to let it rest at that. I had no means of compelling the department to furnish them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is only about two months to the first of the fiscal year, and that department will then have its new appropriation and could print the report then.

Mr. BARNHART. These ditches are liable to run dry before that time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the general debate on the pension bill will be limited, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to 4.35 o'clock p. m.

PENSIONS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15280, the pension appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the pension appropriation bill, with Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma in the chair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair please inform me how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has used 2 hours and 1 minute. The gentleman from Minnesota has used 1 hour and 11 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. [Applause.]

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, although I differ with my Democratic friends on the question of levying duties on foreign imports for protective purposes, I do not impugn their motives. I only claim they are misguided in judgment. All men wish to see our people prosperous, our factories and farmers successful. Republicans believe our success largely depends upon a protective-tariff law to bring prosperity to our people. The Democratic Party believes in a tariff for revenue only, or free trade. I claim both parties can not be correct in their contentions. I am sincere in my opinion and believe the Democrats are sincere.

The people of this country are divided into three distinct divisions. About one-third of our people live in the rural districts—the farmers. About one-third belong to the laboring classes and about one-third to the professional classes—doctors, lawyers, ministers, business men, and such like. Any measure

enacted into law that discriminates against the first class mentioned—the agriculturists—is wrong. The farmers produce the bread and butter for all the people. No doctor, no lawyer, no minister, can live on his library. They depend on the farming class to furnish the necessities of life—food supplies. I say any law that discriminates against the farmers of this country, who are the bone and sinew of the Nation, is neither equitable nor just, and is an assault upon American prosperity.

The Democratic Party is in full power in national politics and is making laws in keeping with their teachings. Many laws of importance have been and are being made by that party which are directly in opposition to principles laid down by the Republican Party. The Democrats are not in power by having received a majority of the votes cast at the last general election, for they received something like 2,450,000 less than a majority. Their being in power was occasioned entirely by a family row in our own party, due to the high regard entertained by some of our people for Mr. Roosevelt. That family row so divided us that the power to legislate was thrown to our opponents.

This country has never prospered under Democratic free-trade rule. Free trade or tariff for revenue only brings foreign labor and foreign products in competition with American labor. Such laws can not lift up degraded labor in foreign countries to a level with the American standard of living, but certainly brings American labor down toward the level of the cheap labor of other countries with whom we must compete.

Over 60,000,000 people live directly south of the United States in the 13 Republics of South America. Each one of these Republics exists under a distinct and different form of government. The Guiana Republics, for the past 400 years controlled by England, France, and Holland, find their people of the laboring class, on account of their free-trade laws, receiving but 30 cents per day, not including board. Chile, a country of low tariffs and export duties, finds her common people in poverty, receiving but 24 to 30 cents per day in gold, not including board.

However, some of these South American Republics have high protective tariff laws, and their manufacturing industries and laborers are prosperous. In Brazil, with high-tariff laws, the scale of wages is as high, if not higher, than in the United States.

China and Japan, free-trade countries, find their common people in poverty and degradation. In short, free-trade countries the world over all have a low standard of wages and living for their common people, and high-tariff countries are correspondingly prosperous. This should be sufficient evidence that the Republican policy of protection is the only one under which the people of the United States, as a whole, as well as capital, can or will be prosperous.

What is the policy of a man who believes in free trade or tariff for revenue only? It is to give American markets to people of lands across the sea and their beneficiaries—the importers; to put the American mill owners out of business and the American wage earners out of employment, in order that he may buy, in foreign countries, articles made by cheap labor, when such articles could and should be made by American labor, enjoying the American standard of living and wages.

A Democratic Member of the House from Illinois, who took a prominent part in the framing of the agricultural schedule in the Underwood tariff law, boasts, so I am informed, that at this early date under the new law we have imported large quantities of Argentine corn. Certainly the importation of Argentine corn is detrimental to the welfare of corn growers in the United States. Argentine corn for the past few months has supplied the Corn Products Refining Co. and the National Starch Co. Both of these companies, if my information is correct, are owned by the Standard Oil Co. A very charitable act, indeed, to help the Standard Oil Co., to the detriment of the farmers of the United States—quite in keeping with Democratic policies.

Our farmers can easily meet competition with other nations of the world, if they are willing to get down to that nation's scale of wages, but such a proposition is a gross insult to American freemen. However, Secretary Redfield, a member of the Democratic administration's Cabinet, boasts that importations of meat have increased from 865,000 pounds during the last three months of 1912 to 33,500,000 pounds for the last three months of 1913 under free trade. Mr. Redfield, I say, boasts of that fact. Our cattle raisers, when going to the polls to vote, will undoubtedly remember that boast.

The farmers of the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota produce large quantities of potatoes annually, yet our Democratic friends are boasting of enormous importations of foreign potatoes. No doubt, when our farmers go to the polls to vote next fall and in November, 1916, they will remember that boast.

In framing the Underwood tariff law the authors thereof evidently had in mind but one class of people in the United States—the consumers, who are not producers of agricultural or manufactured products, forgetting that no consumer can consume unless he obtains employment to obtain money with which to purchase. In framing and enacting this law our Democratic friends have made it possible for labor across the sea to find added employment, and to have increased purchasing power, while thousands of our consumers are walking the streets, without employment or purchasing power, and consuming in a most meager manner.

Lower tariff means increased importations of foreign goods and greater exports of gold to pay for the same, all of which is most disastrous to the prosperity of the people of the United States.

Our Democratic friends know full well that each and every panic that ever existed in this country was largely due to heavy importations of products of the farm and the factory and heavy exports of gold to pay for the same, leaving us without gold and with a surplus of farm and manufactured products, with a depressed market in which to sell.

The following article recently appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer and is an excellent explanation of some of the disadvantageous effects of the free-trade theory and the benefits of protection to American capital and labor:

My only capital is my muscle, energy, and integrity, and, being a cripple, I am often handicapped in the race for bread. But there is red blood in every vein and artery in my body and a heart that throbs for every worker, but especially for the wage earner.

To all these I submit a few facts that will help to see what our tariff legislation threatens. The biggest glass company in the State—Pennsylvania—owns very large works in both this country and Belgium. The company pays workmen in the United States three times the wages it pays in Belgium to the same number of workers for the same grade of work. But it pays three times as large dividends in Belgium as it pays in this country on the same amount of investment.

Now, cut out the protective duties on glass and which body of workers would be employed to make the glass for America? The work will go to the foreigner and idleness and soup houses will be our portion. In Pittsburgh there are 16 plate-glass companies, 21 bottle works, 14 window-glass works, and 10 lamp-chimney, electric-globe works, etc.

The glass company referred to made 80,000 tons of glass in this country in 1911, the raw material for which was soda ash, coal, gas, arsenic, lead, colors, lumber, nails, etc. When the order for 80,000 tons of glass came in an order for 40,000 tons of sand went to four States and an order of 40,000 tons of soda ash went to three States. When the order for soda ash reached their works an order went to limestone quarries for 20,000 tons of lime rock and to salt works for 20,000 tons for salt and to coal mines for 10,000 tons of coal; then to the works to make the soda ash to be delivered to the glass works, thus employing an army of workmen at American wages to work in stone quarry, salt plants, coal mines, soda-ash works, on railroads; then in the glass works, to say nothing of the lumbermen, saw-mills, clerks, etc.

Now, throw out of employment the glassworkers of Pittsburgh alone and down along the line of all above plants goes the crash. Upon each busy glassworker depends a half dozen workmen for wages.

Suppose these idle men knock at the door and ask for work. Work or starvation must come. Then the man who knows it all appears, and his answer is: "Men, what you want is the initiative, referendum, recall, etc." Don't think of starving mothers, wives, and children when you can think of such great questions as I am dreaming about. What say you wage earners? Shall we be duped by dreamers while our wages are paid to tollers beyond the sea? There are two ways to prevent this—one is to cut our wages; the other is to restore protective duties by returning to power the Republican Party. After we succeed we may listen to those who are dreaming.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Sure.

Mr. FORDNEY. It can not truthfully be denied that a majority of the people of the United States are in favor of protection to American industries and labor, for, although the party in power candidly believe in free trade or a tariff for revenue only, they are not in power by having received a majority of the votes cast at the polls in November, 1912.

No one will deny that the votes cast for Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt in that election were cast by people who believed in the policy of protection, and the votes cast for the Democratic and Socialistic candidates combined fall far short of a majority of the votes polled. Therefore it can not be claimed by the friends of the Underwood tariff bill that this law has been placed upon our statutes at the request of a majority of our voters.

The Socialists do not even believe in levying a tariff for revenue purposes. They want free trade on imports, and they also want a division of all property held by our people. They can not be considered as being in sympathy with either the Democratic or Republican policies, for they are not. That there has been a sentiment among many of our people for a change of some kind will not be denied. For the past several years a great many agitators have been at work stirring up discontent. Some of these men I credit with being sincere, but a great number were at work solely for the purpose of gaining personal political favor. It is easy to criticize, but difficult to suggest practical changes to better conditions. When a man is

in straitened financial circumstances it is easy to influence him by argument that a change of some kind will be beneficial to him, for he feels he has nothing to lose and everything to gain. This agitation undoubtedly aided in putting the Democratic Party in control at the last general election.

During the past 10 years or more the cost of living has materially increased, but up to 1913 employment has been plentiful and good wages have been paid—higher wages than ever before—and during no period of our history have the laboring men been better clothed, better fed, or enjoyed more of the comforts of life. We passed through a period of low prices under a free-trade law from 1894 to 1897, but employment was scarce, and many had little or no purchasing power, and there was much suffering and hardship. That period of low prices and hard times has been forgotten by many. In fact, it is shown by statistics that about 51 per cent of the people who voted at the general election in 1896 are now dead, and that hundreds of thousands of the voters of to-day were but 5 years of age in 1896 and know nothing of the conditions that existed under the Wilson tariff-for-revenue-only measure, or free-trade law, from 1894 to 1897, which caused such widespread suffering and shrinkage in values. The necessities of life reached bottom prices known to this country, yet, as before stated, the country never knew a time of greater suffering and distress among our poor people, a condition so absolutely reversed from 1897 down to 1913.

In the campaign of 1896 our Democratic friends claimed we did not have enough money in the country with which to do the business of the country, and that if we had more and easy money prices of all commodities would advance, which was so much desired at that time. The contention of the Republican Party was that it was not so much more money that was required as it was a restoration of confidence and the exclusion from our markets of the products of cheap labor from abroad, and a preservation of our home markets for our manufactured and agricultural products.

At that time we had \$22 per capita in circulation, but now our Democratic friends claim, although we have \$35 per capita in circulation in the United States, that we need more money and easier money to bring down prices, and to substantiate this theory they point with pride to the currency law recently passed. They believe that measure will cure all our financial ills. We all agree that more easy money would add to our prosperity, provided our people were furnished with employment, but this can only be done by preserving American markets for the articles we can produce in this country. It is impossible to bring prosperity by inviting greater importations of foreign competitive products at low prices, thus closing the doors of our factories and displacing American labor for the employment of cheap labor of foreign countries.

Seventeen years have elapsed since our last experiment with free trade and low tariff, and many have been led to believe their incomes have not increased in proportion to the cost of living and that low prices are desirable. Generally speaking, everyone has something to sell—it is either his labor or a product of labor. It is equally true that everyone has to buy. If all could get better prices for what they have to sell and have lower prices on what they have to buy, it would be an ideal change, but the absurdity of such a proposition is self-evident, for we must buy and sell to one another. However, many, ignorant of conditions under former periods of low prices, or closing their eyes to those conditions, have been led to believe that prices can be lowered without a corresponding decrease in wages and employment. In 1896 we claimed we needed a party in power during those panicky days that would bring confidence to the people and bring out of hiding the money we had and put it in circulation, and we made this argument then and succeeded, and had the greatest measure of prosperity from 1897 to 1913 that any people in any country under the sun have ever enjoyed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My Democratic friends, one thing in which I believe I am right, and you will agree with me, is that you who live south of the Mason and Dixon line are natural-born free traders. It comes as nature to you. When the 13 Colonies formed into a Union and adopted a Constitution the people of this country soon became divided in their views on the power of Congress, under the Constitution, to impose on foreign imports a tax sufficiently high for protective purposes. The people were divided into two classes, called "loose constructionists" and "strict constructionists." The strict constructionists were free traders, who contended the Constitution gave Congress no right to impose a tax on imports greater than would yield a sufficient sum of money to pay the running expenses of the Government. The loose constructionists were protectionists. George Washington and Alexander Hamilton and others who helped frame the Constitution took the view of the loose constructionists,

that the Constitution of the United States did give Congress the right to impose a duty on foreign imports not only for the raising of money to pay the running expenses of this Government, but to protect the industries of this country against cheap foreign labor.

John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, Secretary of State in 1824, was chosen President by the House of Representatives in February, 1825. Each State having one vote, 13 States voted for Adams; 7 for Jackson, of Tennessee; and 4 for Crawford, of Georgia.

The Adams and Clay factions were protectionists, or so-called loose constructionists, and when put into power passed a tariff act in 1828. The southern Members of Congress were almost a unit for free trade or tariff for revenue only.

South Carolina, on November 19, 1832, at a State convention held at Columbus, declared the tariff acts of 1828 and 1832 to be "null and void" and no law, and not binding upon that State, and declared she would not permit the collection of duties on imports into South Carolina and threatened secession, and only yielded after President Jackson issued a proclamation, December 16, 1832, warning that State against such action, and followed up his proclamation by sending a naval force to Charleston Harbor and provided guards for the customs officials, thus ending that secession controversy and tariff dispute.

In the Southern States slavery was lawful, and the people there were chiefly engaged in raising cotton. With slave labor, the cheapest labor in the world, they could compete in the production of cotton with any country in the world. They wanted cheap manufactured products and cheap foodstuff for their slaves, and were frank and open in opposition to tariff protection for the factories of the North, claiming the people of the North should turn their attention to agricultural pursuits, which would enable the South to obtain a ready and abundant supply of foodstuff for the slave labor at the lowest possible cost. They also contended that by free trade manufactured articles could be obtained from abroad at a lower price than at home under a protective tariff. Knowing Europe must be looked to as a market for the major portion of their cotton, they realized the possibility, under free trade, of exchanging cotton for cheap European manufactured products.

In the campaign of 1844 James K. Polk, a candidate for the Presidency, was accused of being in favor of a tariff for revenue only—a polite term for free trade. To offset this accusation, Polk and his friends issued a letter and published it broadcast over the country. In part, it was as follows:

James K. Polk has ever pursued a straightforward and consistent course upon the tariff, as well as upon other questions of national policy, and he is now most decidedly and unequivocally committed in favor of a tariff which shall afford fair and just protection to agriculture, manufacturing—

And so forth.

This letter satisfied the so-called loose constructionists, or more properly called protectionists, and Polk was elected, and George M. Dallas, of Pennsylvania, an avowed protectionist, was elected Vice President.

Congress met December 1, 1845. The Democrats, or strict constructionists, were in the majority in both branches of Congress. The President's message condemned all antislavery agitation, recommended a subtreasury, and a tariff for revenue only. At that session of Congress, on July 30, the tariff act of 1846 was passed by a party vote. It followed the strict constructionists' theories of establishing rates of duties sufficient only to provide revenue for the Government, without regard for protection. On one tie vote in the Senate, Dallas cast the deciding ballot and voted for free trade. President Polk signed the bill—the so-called Walker Tariff Act—and that act resulted in the loss of our balance of trade. With the exception of a single year during the life of the bill our imports exceeded our exports, as the following table explains. The balance of trade against the United States averaged \$34,000,000 for 10 years.

Balance of trade of the United States from 1847 to 1857.

Year.	Excess of imports over exports.	Excess of exports over imports.
1847.....		\$34,317,249
1848.....	\$10,448,129	
1849.....	855,027	
1850.....	29,153,800	
1851.....	21,856,170	
1852.....	40,456,167	
1853.....	60,287,983	
1854.....	60,760,030	
1855.....	38,899,205	
1856.....	29,212,887	
1857.....	54,004,582	

Our Democratic friends have ever since claimed that we had a period of prosperity due to that bill. Gentlemen, they are mistaken. We did have prosperity, but it was not due to the tariff law at that time, because that law brought a balance of trade against us every year that it was upon our statute books, except the first year after its adoption. Gold was discovered in California, and we had war with Mexico, and there was war in Europe, all of which created a great demand for the products of this country. We produced somewhere from fifty to one hundred million dollars a year of gold, and it kept the Treasury of the United States from running dry in paying our foreign debts. The strict constructionists came back into power in 1856 and adopted a measure giving much more free trade than was provided in the Walker tariff law, and the panic of 1857 ensued.

It is interesting to observe how history is repeating itself. In the campaign of 1912 President Wilson in public utterances assured the people of this country, if elected President of the United States, he would injure no legitimate industry. I heard many protectionists during that campaign say they would vote for Wilson because of his publicly announced friendliness to protection. They were misguided, for, like Mr. Polk in 1844 and 1845, President Wilson, after committing himself to protection, has signed a bill for free trade, or tariff for revenue only. President Wilson, after nearly three score and ten years, has followed in the footsteps of Polk.

If I am correctly informed, President Wilson, while the convention at Baltimore was in session, assured the people of Louisiana he would not in the least injure the cane-sugar industry of the South; but we see to-day a tariff law on our statute books, signed by President Wilson, which will eventually place sugar on the free list. Sugar mill after sugar mill in the State of Louisiana is going into the hands of receivers.

I again say, history is repeating itself after to these many years. Wilson has followed the footsteps of James K. Polk, who, over his own signature, in the letter above referred to, befogged the minds of the people of the United States, from whom he was then seeking support.

President Polk, in his message to Congress of December 2, 1845, said, in regard to the tariff:

The attention of Congress is invited to the importance of making suitable modifications and reductions of the rates of duty imposed by our present tariff law. The object of imposing duties on imports should be to raise revenue to pay the necessary expenses of the Government. Congress may undoubtedly, in the exercise of a sound discretion, discriminate in arranging the rates of duty on different articles; but the discrimination should be within the revenue standard and be made with the view to raising money for the support of the Government. * * * Taxation, direct or indirect, is a burden, and it should be imposed as to operate as equally as may be on all classes in the proportion of their ability to bear it. To make the taxing power an actual benefit to one class necessarily increases the burdens of the others beyond their proportion and would be manifestly unjust.

The terms "protection to domestic industry" are of popular import, but they should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer or the planter who tills his fields is engaged in domestic industry and is as much entitled to have his labor protected as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator, or the mechanic. * * * The joint labor of all these classes constitutes the aggregate of the domestic industries of the Nation, and they are equally entitled to the Nation's protection. No one of them can justly claim to be the exclusive recipient of the protection, which can only be afforded by increasing burdens on the domestic industries of the others.

President Wilson, in his message which he read in the House of Representatives Tuesday, April 8, 1913, said:

We have seen tariff legislation wander very far afield in our day. * * * The object of tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition with whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world. * * * We must build up trade, we need the outlet and the enlarged field of energy more than we ever did before. We must build up industries as well as adopt freedom in the place of artificial stimulation only so far as it will build up, not pull down.

And, gentlemen, you from south of the Mason-Dixon line believe in a tariff for revenue only, which is nothing other than free trade, because it does not make any difference what amount of duties you put upon an imported article, if it is below the point of protection it cripples the industries of this country and is equivalent to free trade. If you are going to drown me, it makes no difference whether you put me 10 feet under water or 10 inches, just so long as there is enough water to cover my head you are going to accomplish your object. And it makes no difference how low you put the duty, whether it is absolutely free or below a protective point, it is free trade and means disaster to the institutions of this country.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. FESS. I think for the sake of the record, with reference to 1844, when James K. Polk was elected upon that promise, you ought also to state that he defeated the greatest protectionist the country ever knew—Henry Clay.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. Gentlemen, my time will be too limited to give you the full extent of my argument along this line, but I want to impress upon you the fact that a Democrat votes for free trade because that theory is instilled in him. He was born a free trader, brought up on free-trade doctrine, and will not be shown the error of his way.

During the campaign preceding the last general election the Democratic Party, among other things, pledged itself to furnish ample employment and reduce the cost of living. They are now in power; they have placed a tariff law on our statute books, and the results of their efforts are beginning to be shown. I am most firmly convinced reduced wages must and will accompany lower prices, and from reports rapidly coming in the number of unemployed is increasing at an alarming rate. It appears if low prices are in store for us low wages and lack of employment will reach us first, and that lack of purchasing power will to a large measure be responsible for depressed prices, if depressed prices come.

The argument of the man who believes in free trade or tariff for revenue only is made solely from the viewpoint of a consumer. He loses sight of the fact the consumer's income may be affected. He forgets there are two sides to the argument. Let us see whether his position is logical or whether there is substantial ground for argument.

For example, he believes if a suit of clothes can be produced in England or any other foreign country and furnished to the consumers in this country at a lower cost than similar clothes can be manufactured in this country, that we should encourage the purchase of such clothes from abroad and let the consumer have the benefit. He uses the same argument in connection with other articles of consumption in this country which can be produced abroad cheaper than at home. In answer to that theory permit me to say I have on my back a suit of clothes of medium quality, and in the converting of the cloth and trimmings into the finished product labor received \$17.50. If this suit of clothes had been made in England, by labor receiving but 40 per cent of the wages paid for the same class of labor in the tailor shops of this country, it would deprive our labor of just that much employment and correspondingly reduce their purchasing power. The same applies to all labor in this country engaged in producing anything that can be produced more cheaply abroad. That labor must turn its attention to other pursuits, which could not be found to take care of all, and that labor would join the great army of unemployed and to a large measure would be compelled to live—partly, at least—upon charity.

By purchasing abroad we would open up new shops and factories in Europe and increase employment in foreign countries, and, as was the case under the Wilson bill from 1894 to 1897, we would quench the fires under our furnaces and close the doors of our factories and place signs thereon, "No labor wanted." Signs of that character were conspicuous in every town and city in the land during those days, but were removed from 1897 to 1913. They are again being displayed, and in increased numbers, in every city, and many of our laboring men are seeking employment.

As the beet-sugar industry and the cane-sugar industry in this country expanded the refiners of foreign imported sugar, the Sugar Trust, started a campaign for a removal of import duties on sugar. The matter has been constantly before Congress for several years past. With the aid of the Democratic Party, the Sugar Trust has at last won its fight. By the passage of the Underwood tariff law the Democratic Party has condemned the domestic sugar industry to a slow but certain death. This law made some reductions in the duty on sugar to take effect March 1 and provided, further, that after May 1, 1916, all sugar should be admitted free of duty. It is so evident the sugar industry can not survive free trade that certain insurance companies have canceled their policies of insurance on sugar factories, so I am informed, in the State of Louisiana. Formerly it was comparatively easy to borrow money on the property of a sugar company. To-day such a loan is considered unsafe, and we now see cane-sugar factories in the States of Louisiana and Texas, one after another, passing into the hands of receivers or closing their doors. Other factories have reduced the price to be paid to the farmers for beets. The result is to enable the Sugar Trust of the country to monopolize more of the trade.

Is the Democratic Party ignorant of the fact the sugar industry will be injured? As evidence of the fact that they realize injury will be done I wish to call attention to the fact that in the Agricultural appropriation bill there is a large appropriation of money—\$50,000—to be used in educating the peo-

ple of the cane fields in the South in other pursuits. Such an appropriation is made at the expense of the people and in the interest of the Sugar Trust and no others.

It is and always has been my contention that the prosperity of this Nation depends primarily upon a protected home industry by adequate tariff rates on importations of foreign competitive products. So much has been said concerning the tariff that it is considered by some a threadbare subject. It is my experience, though, that those who call it a threadbare subject are mostly free traders. It is also my experience that calling the tariff threadbare is the only way many free traders can reply to a statement of tariff facts. The tariff has always been the great Democratic stumbling block.

It is my desire to call attention to a few startling facts from which an open-minded man can draw but one conclusion in regard to the effect of low-tariff legislation. Since the adoption of the Underwood tariff law I have diligently studied the advance reports from the Department of Commerce regarding our foreign trade. I have watched the daily Treasury statements and the reports from our foreign consular officers, and I have endeavored to get expressions from American manufacturers as to business conditions, and I will attempt to present the facts and figures to you in concise and concrete form as I proceed.

Gentlemen, the most effective way to destroy the comforts of life and the enjoyments of a good home and a high standard of living for the laboring classes of this country is to vote to bring into this country the products of cheap labor when employed across the sea.

Something was said here not long ago about child labor. I want to show you something in that regard, and I ask you to bear with me. I will be as brief as possible.

The following appears from Consul Edwin S. Cunningham, of Bombay, India, in the Daily Consular and Trade Report for June 24, 1912:

The employment of women and children in factories is of considerable importance; 43,401 women and 10,816 children were so engaged in 1910. An analysis of the statistics shows that during the last five years the number of women employed in the city of Bombay has gradually decreased, being 25,093 in 1906 and 22,288 in 1910, while in the country districts there has been a gradual increase—19,617 in 1906 against 21,113 in 1910. On the other hand, the employment of children in the city of Bombay has been growing, from 2,741 in 1906 to 3,942 in 1910. In the country, in the former year, 5,918 children were employed and in the latter 6,874.

The following is taken from the Daily Consular and Trade Report of April 16, 1913, from the report of Consul General T. St. John Gaffney, of Dresden, Germany:

In former days the German wage-earning woman was, as a rule, only to be found in agricultural districts, but now they are forsaking country life in increasing numbers and are going to the cities, where great industries are springing up and demanding their labor. The number of women wage earners in Germany is now larger than in any European country, and from census reports it appears that it is steadily increasing.

In 1882 the women employed in occupations other than domestic service numbered over 4,000,000; 25 years later the figures stood at 8,000,000; and while the employment of men has increased 20 per cent during the same period, at present a full third of the economic labor of the Empire is being carried on by women. Statistics recently published show that there are 9,500,000 wage-earning women in Germany, which means that nearly every second adult woman is earning her own living and directly contributing to the wealth of the country. There is no doubt that to their work is largely due the wonderful industrial advance made by Germany, which is one of the most remarkable features in recent European history.

The fact that women compete with men in many of the great industries is now accepted as a matter of course. This large army of women wage earners is gradually awakening to a realization of its importance, and it is claiming rights and privileges which have hitherto been asked for only by men. In 1906 there were no less than 37 women's trades unions, comprising nearly 119,000 members.

The following appears in the Daily Consular and Trade Report for January 13, 1914, from Consul George Nicholas Ifft, of Nuremberg, Germany:

For the purpose of fixing the rates for the imperial sick, accident, old-age, and disability insurance systems, the district insurance officers all over Germany are required to establish by careful investigation at stated intervals the average wages paid for unskilled labor in the cities and rural communities of their respective districts. The investigation recently completed for the city of Nuremberg, one of the important manufacturing centers of Europe, with a population of 355,000, shows the daily wages paid to male and female laborers in specified age groups as follows: Over 21 years of age—male, 88 cents; female, 50 cents; between 16 and 21 years of age—male, 71½ cents; female, 45 cents; under 16 years of age—male, 43 cents; female, 31 cents. These rates mark an increase of about 9 per cent over 1910, when the average wage of an adult unskilled laborer in Nuremberg was 81 cents per day.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In what country are those wages paid?

Mr. FORDNEY. Germany.

The following is taken from the report of Consul General A. M. Thackara, of Berlin, in the Daily Trade and Consular Report for July 15, 1913:

According to the statistics of 1907 (the latest official figures), the proportion of men and women employed in the metal-working industries in Germany is as follows:

	Men.	Women.
Helpers and workpeople:		
16 years and over.....	580,097	60,558
14 to 16 years.....	79,970	9,118
Under 14 years.....	2,895	470
Apprentices:		
16 years and over.....	56,888	528
14 to 16 years.....	60,519	1,663
Under 14 years.....	2,003	240

Remember, gentlemen, that under free trade the products of that labor come into competition with the products of labor in this country.

Here is another report showing the employment of women in the woolen and cotton mills of Germany. In the cotton mills, where there is a large amount of child labor employed, the wages to the average cotton-mill employee is 64 cents a day. In the woolen mills the wages run from 40 cents to 64 cents a day.

My Democratic friends, you have put wool on the free list. You have put a 35 per cent ad valorem duty on manufactured woolen goods. That duty is below the protective point, and before I conclude I will show you the amount of importations of woolen goods.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POST. The gentleman just made the statement that we had placed raw wool on the free list. I will ask is it not a fact that raw wool in Michigan and Ohio brings a higher price to-day than it brought one year ago or two years ago?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know, my friend, whether the price is higher or not. I think it is about the same.

I do not know whether this claim is correct or not. It is claimed, however, there is a shortage of the world's supply of wool, but that claim is made by the importers of wool. But I am going to ask the gentleman a question. On the 1st day of December, when this law took effect, putting wool on the free list, wools of the first class paid 11 cents a pound duty and wools of the second class paid 12 cents a pound duty and wools of the third class paid from 3 to 7 cents a pound, owing to the value of the wool. The market value of wools in this country did not change one fraction of a penny, but the foreigner took that money formerly paid as duty and put it in his pocket, and the Treasury of the United States is being deprived of from twelve to fourteen million dollars a year duty which was collected on wool last year. The foreigner is getting it, and the consumer here is not. Can the gentleman tell me how that happens? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. POST. Can the gentleman explain to me how the foreigner gets the duty when there is no duty collected?

Mr. FORDNEY. Before the Underwood tariff law took effect, before wool went on the free list—on the 1st day of December last—I say the duty on wool of the first class was 11 cents a pound, and at that time foreign wools were selling in Philadelphia at 23 cents a pound. Before the duty was removed, when the foreigner at that time brought his wool to this country and sold it for 23 cents a pound, he paid 11 cents out of that 23 cents to Uncle Sam for the right to dispose of his wools in our markets; but since the 1st day of December, 1913, he takes that money home with him—the entire 23 cents, my friends. Can the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. If my colleague's position is correct, that the prices have gone up, what becomes of the argument they adduced that the cost of living would come down? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and I want to call the gentleman's attention to another argument.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FORDNEY. In just one moment. Let me answer a little further. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] to this fact, and no man has given a satisfactory explanation of the cause: When the Payne tariff bill was enacted into law hides were put on the free list. Up to

that time hides had paid a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem. Hides were selling at 10½ cents a pound on January 1, 1909, and 10 months later, after being placed upon the free list, hides sold for 17½ cents a pound. Can the gentleman tell me what caused this rise in price on hides?

Mr. POST. I happen to be a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which investigated the Shipping Trust, and it was proven conclusively in the hearings had before that committee that the Shipping Trust increased the rates of freight equal to the tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, I believe that is a mistake. I have a statement of the rates of freight on wool from every principal city in this country west of the Mississippi River which I will give; also, the freight on wool from Australia and New Zealand, and from South America and from Europe, and none of the freight rates exceed 2 cents per pound from the point of production to Boston, which market is the great wool market in the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] to state that the Shipping Trust added that much to the freight when we reduced the tariff on certain things, and I assume he takes the position that they took the tariff off for the benefit of the Shipping Trust. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. POST. My remarks applied to hides.

Mr. MANN. Very well. According to the gentleman's position, we took the tariff off hides for the benefit of the Shipping Trust. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell my friend from Ohio [Mr. Post] what was the cause, in my opinion. When the duty was taken off hides, it was notice to the world that the United States was short of a hide supply for our tanneries, and the people who had hides to export to the United States took advantage of that notice and put up their price, and were benefited thereby.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wanted to suggest that if the gentleman from Ohio is correct, he not only gave the tariff to the Shipping Trust, but his party also gave that trust a subsidy of 5 per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and their Attorney General has now declared that law is unconstitutional. I thought it unconstitutional when they passed it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Upon that point, if the gentleman will permit me, ever since this administration has been in power there have been at least three suits that I know of, begun under a former administration, against shipping combines and shipping trusts, and this administration has made no progress, so far as I am able to ascertain, in the prosecution of those cases, and taken no steps toward doing so. What is the reason?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not know of those lawsuits.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is true.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I should like to inquire whether or not the imports into this country are brought over in American ships or in foreign ships, and whether it is an American subsidy or a foreign subsidy.

Mr. POST. We have no American ships.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; we have, although they are very few. But before I finish I am going to show you, Mr. Post, what your party said in your platform about aiding American ships, and you will run with shame for the cloakroom.

Mr. POST. I assure you I will not scud to the cellar.

Mr. FORDNEY. You will admit that your President can shift his position mighty quickly, if you do not run.

I have here another consular report, which states the average wages paid in Germany in the cotton and woolen mills is \$132.09 per year to the average laborer—adult and child labor combined—and \$122.33 per year in France. Yet you, my Democratic friends, have voted to remove the tariff and bring into this country the products of that French and German labor in competition with the products of American labor, that receives from \$1.50 to \$3 or \$4 a day.

Mr. POST rose.

Mr. FORDNEY. Pardon me just a moment.

Now, let us see, my friends, what France thinks about a protective tariff. France imports our cotton free of duty. We produce 60 per cent of all the cotton raised in the world. There is no duty on raw cotton going into France, I say; but if you or I were to take into France the finished product of one bale of cotton made into knit goods we would have to take along the

value of 11 bales of cotton at the present price—15 cents per pound—to pay the duty on the manufactured product of 1 bale of cotton. You do not believe in placing a protective duty upon the finished product of cotton coming back into this country from abroad. Cotton raised in this country and exported to Belgium, where labor receives 15 to 30 cents a day, is coming back here in millions of dollars' worth of manufactured cotton goods, brought into this country from Belgium, Germany, France, and England, and sold at a price that will compete with us and even undersell us, because your Democratic tariff upon imported cotton is below the protective point. I call your attention to some imports, as follows:

NOTEWORTHY INCREASES IN LEEDS EXPORTS.

(Consul Homer M. Byington, Leeds, England.)

[From the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, Apr. 29, 1914.]

The quarter ended March 31 clearly demonstrated the effects of the recent changes in the United States tariff upon the export trade of Leeds. The increase in shipments is noteworthy. The total exports to the United States for the quarter were \$613,388, as compared with \$297,259 for the corresponding quarter of 1913. Leather shipments increased from \$47,507 to \$211,138, salted hides from \$176 to \$13,898, rugs from \$1,748 to \$44,547, shoddy from nil to \$18,681, woollens and worsteds from \$4,672 to \$33,763, traveling rugs from nil to \$20,877. During the quarter 589 invoices were certified, as compared with 243 in 1913 and a total of 1,047 for the whole of the year 1913.

Imports of merchandise ready for consumption in February, 1914, showing increase compared with imports in same month in 1913.

Products.	1914 values.	1913 values.	increase.	Per cent.
Aluminum, manufactures of.....	\$136,873	\$78,373	\$58,500	74.6
Watches and parts of.....	250,018	182,237	67,781	37.0
Cotton cloths.....	1,454,439	727,121	727,318	100.0
Stockings.....	372,741	265,169	107,572	40.5
Other knit goods.....	340,637	43,825	296,812	677.0
Linen yarns.....	88,806	62,287	26,519	42.7
Fruit and nuts.....	3,523,651	2,523,651	1,000,000	29.0
Glassware.....	561,420	463,947	97,473	21.0
Cutlery.....	212,356	157,658	54,698	34.6
Tin plate.....	209,938	27,979	181,959	650.0
Leather and tanned skins.....	1,357,428	755,549	601,879	79.6
Gloves.....	850,933	782,973	67,960	8.6
Paper and manufactures of.....	1,998,835	1,581,723	417,112	26.0
Manufactures of silk.....	3,126,092	2,257,264	868,828	38.4
Vegetables.....	1,222,778	848,255	374,523	44.0
Wool, class 1.....	4,398,235	2,192,326	2,205,909	100.0
Wool, class 2.....	690,195	248,278	441,917	178.0
Wool, class 3.....	1,687,964	1,211,219	476,745	39.0
Dress goods.....	782,121	262,938	519,183	197.0
Woolen cloths.....	1,504,197	464,742	1,039,455	236.0
Wearing apparel.....	142,555	113,947	28,608	25.0
All other wool manufactures.....	484,450	85,501	398,949	466.0
Total.....	25,198,594	15,336,962	9,861,632	64.2

The above figures are from official sources, and show increases of imports that leave no doubt as to what the Underwood tariff law is doing to industries employing large numbers of American working men and women. This money paid for increased imports would have furnished employment here for 197,232 people, at \$50 per month, for one month.

Imports of merchandise ready for consumption in March, 1914, showing increase compared with imports in the same month in 1913.

Product.	1914 values.	1913 values.	Increase.	Percentage of increase.
Aluminum, manufactures of.....	\$168,000	\$60,767	\$107,233	176.4
Watches and parts of.....	317,329	205,280	112,049	54.5
Cotton cloths.....	1,402,071	721,902	680,169	94.2
Stockings.....	417,473	241,455	176,018	72.8
Other knit goods.....	366,251	44,675	321,576	719.8
Linen yarns.....	95,248	55,958	39,290	70.1
Fruit and nuts.....	4,012,244	3,088,108	924,136	29.9
Glassware.....	768,349	498,674	269,675	54.0
Cutlery.....	272,460	146,979	125,481	85.3
Tin plate.....	185,130	23,298	161,832	694.6
Leather and tanned skins.....	1,556,342	635,660	920,673	144.8
Gloves.....	990,977	755,242	235,735	31.2
Paper and manufactures of.....	2,529,933	1,783,048	746,885	41.8
Manufactures of silk.....	3,695,975	2,694,608	1,001,367	37.1
Vegetables.....	1,423,939	960,857	463,082	48.1
Wool, class 1.....	5,253,229	2,681,544	2,571,685	95.9
Wool, class 2.....	616,845	383,638	233,207	60.7
Wool, class 3.....	2,066,013	1,197,512	868,501	72.6
Woolen cloths.....	1,396,910	328,974	1,067,936	324.0
Dress goods.....	740,928	225,973	514,955	227.0
Wearing apparel.....	170,480	165,087	5,393	3.2
All other manufactures of wool.....	772,544	95,617	676,927	707.0
Total.....	29,218,670	16,994,865	12,223,805	71.9

The above figures are from official sources, showing a heavy increase in imports over March, 1913, and past months under the Underwood tariff law, proving even more conclusively than the figures of January and February what this law is doing to American industries employing large numbers of workmen. This money sent abroad would have given employment to 245,000 people one month at \$50 per month.

Imports of wool and manufactures of wool in March, 1914, compared with imports in March, 1913.

	1914		
	Pounds.	Value.	Unit.
Wool:			
Class 1.....	21,872,566	\$5,253,229	\$0.241
Class 2.....	2,506,018	616,845	.244
Class 3.....	12,063,190	2,066,013	.171
Total.....	36,441,774	7,936,087	
Cloths.....	1,314,242	1,396,910	1.055
Dress goods.....	763,761	740,928	.97
Carpets.....	185,565	379,950	4.44
Wearing apparel.....		170,480	
All other manufactures of wool.....		772,544	
Wool wastes free.....	1,315,731	194,303	
Hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, etc.....	154,838	65,950	
Manufactures of the hair of the Angora goat, etc.....		229,681	
Total.....		11,886,833	

	1913			Increase value.	Per cent.
	Pounds.	Value.	Unit.		
Wool:					
Class 1.....	11,701,450	\$2,681,544	\$0.233	\$2,571,685	95.9
Class 2.....	1,487,584	383,638	.257	233,207	60.7
Class 3.....	9,074,796	1,197,512	.131	868,501	72.6
Total.....	22,063,830	4,262,694		3,673,393	86.1
Cloths.....	283,691	328,974	1.159	1,067,936	324
Dress goods.....	1,042,812	225,973	.216	514,955	227
Carpets.....	178,572	311,337	3.97	68,113	21.8
Wearing apparel.....		165,087		5,393	3.2
All other manufactures of wool.....		95,617		676,927	707
Wool wastes free.....				194,303	100
Hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, etc.....				65,950	100
Manufactures of the hair of the Angora goat, etc.....				229,681	100
Total.....		5,390,182		6,496,651	120.5

¹ Square yards.

March shows the largest increase in imports of wool and manufactures of wool under the Underwood law as compared with the same month in the previous year under the Payne law.

If this money paid for wool and woollens had been kept at home, it would have given employment to 130,000 people at \$50 per month for one month.

President Wilson has stated publicly that he would injure no legitimate industry. I take it he meant that through his political action he would injure no legitimate industry; that he would sanction no law harmful to our industries. I wish to ask: Does anyone know of any new factories being built in the United States due to encouragement given in the Underwood tariff law? President Wilson sanctioned that law. Do you know of any additional employment given to our laborers? Do you know of any additional happiness or prosperity coming to our people? Do you know of any people enjoying greater prosperity through the effects of this tariff act? Yes, we know of such added prosperity, but where is it? It is in Europe, not here; and the statistics I have just given are proof of this assertion. Both English and Irish papers, with glowing headlines, teem with encouraging editorials to their people: "Cheer up, laborers and business men; we see a rift in the dark clouds that have hung over the western horizon for so these many years. The Democratic Party in the Congress of the United States has removed the barrier; they have torn down the Republican protective-tariff wall and have bid us a welcome. We can now find a market in the United States for much of our products, which market for the past 18 years has been practically closed to us."

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. In the gentleman's judgment, how many men are there out of employment in this country by reason of the Underwood tariff law?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am going to reach that in just a minute, and I will detail it.

Mr. POST. Does the gentleman know that throughout the entire corn belt the farmers can not get labor at all, even at the very highest wages?

Mr. FORDNEY. If you will just be patient, I will show you where you can find plenty of unemployed people.

Mr. POST. If there is an army of unemployed, why is it that the corn-belt farmers can not get help?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. They are raising corn in Argentina now for the United States.

Mr. NORTON. Would the fact that the price of corn has been so greatly reduced within the past 12 months probably have something to do with the fact that the farmers are not able to employ help?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; there is much in that statement.

Mr. POST. Does not the gentleman know that the farmers—

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post] that every day for the last month I have received letters from people asking me to find them jobs, and saying they were thrown out of employment by the Democratic administration. I will refer them to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Post].

Mr. FORDNEY. Fifteen minutes before I came on the floor of the House I was importuned by a poor person who was out of money and out of everything to eat, who said he would have to camp in a dry-goods box to-night unless given aid.

Mr. BOOHER. I should like to ask my friend from Washington a question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Ask it of me, not of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to have you ask the gentleman from Washington if the people he refers to were Republicans whom the Democrats have turned out of a job?

Mr. FORDNEY. It does not make any difference whether they are Republicans or Democrats; they are out of a job, and you put them out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I got a letter from one of them who said he was a Democrat in the last election, but that he would never vote the Democratic ticket again.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman vouch for his previous Democracy?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Was not that letter written because he thought that was the best play he could make in writing to the gentleman?

Mr. FORDNEY. I can not tell you what is in Democrats' minds. Here I have another consular report from Germany. Average weekly wages of arms and ammunition workers: Polishers, \$11.65; turners, \$11.65; drillers, \$8.03; ammunition drillers, \$10.21; helpers, \$6.67; laborers, \$6.69; and the weekly hours of work are from 52 to 56 hours. Sixty thousand women and children are employed in these ammunition factories in Germany, many of them under 13 years of age, at very small wages.

Mr. Redfield said in a speech which he made at Wheeling, W. Va., on February 23, 1914:

But there is no ground here now for worry. The surplus of freight cars has ceased to grow. It commenced about the middle of January to decline, and has decreased by about 5,000 cars. I have found in the last fortnight the reports of improving business so many and so general that it has been impossible for me to consider them all. Argentine beef is being shipped to New York free of the tariff tax, and this has resulted in a decline in the wholesale New York market for beef of about 4 cents a pound.

Is that encouraging news to the cattle growers of the United States?

Butter has been reduced in price by the large recent importations of that food. The importations of Argentine corn has, during the recent winter, operated at least to prevent a rise in the price of corn in our Atlantic coast cities, if it has not directly reduced the price in those cities.

What comfort can Mr. Redfield get out of the fact that because of his party's action he has taken the bread and butter from the mouths of the very people that support him in his present position? It is the people of the United States he should aid through legislation. The value of farmers' products has been decreased. Is there any glory in that sort of an argument for our producers? If so, I want him to have it all; I do not want any of that kind of glory.

Now, how about idle cars? Is Mr. Redfield correct? I have an official statement furnished me on the 22d of April of this year, which says there were 70,000 idle cars on the 15th of April, 1913, and 213,000 idle on the 15th of April, 1914.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And it is growing.

Mr. FORDNEY. It is growing—81,000 idle cars added to the number in a single month, from March 15 to April 15 of this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman expect it would make any difference in the statement of Mr. Roseyfield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know as to that. For several years past it has been the attitude of the Democratic Party that a low tariff or free trade would greatly increase our ex-

port trade; that manufactures required free raw material to meet foreign competition. Secretary Redfield made a speech in May, 1913, while the new tariff law was being considered in Congress, in which he said:

The day of industrial fear is passing.

He also said:

We have shaken off the shackles of real industrial slavery to enter the arena of free competition, strong, athletic, and vigorous, in which our business will be stronger and safer and in which we shall be happier than before.

Secretary Redfield in December pointed with pride to the great balance of trade of the United States for the year 1913—nearly \$700,000,000—and made glowing prophecies for the future.

Oh, where is it now? Where is Redfield? Adopting an expression recently used in the Senate, he is "under the ammunition wagon" so far as this kind of argument is concerned.

Gentlemen, our balance of trade in our favor since 1897 has averaged under a Republican protective-tariff law about \$45,000,000 to \$50,000,000 a month, or in the neighborhood of \$600,000,000 a year for all these years. Under this Underwood tariff law there is no fair comparison to be made except since the 1st day of March, and for this reason: Although that law took effect on the 3d day of October last, wool did not go on the free list until the 1st day of December. Manufactured woollens did not go on the free list until the 1st day of January, 1914. The duty on sugar was not reduced until the 1st day of March. So that March of this year is the only fair comparison of exports and imports under this law as compared with our Republican tariff law. Our balance of trade for the month of March fell off to \$5,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Four million eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. FORDNEY. Four million eight hundred thousand dollars. I thank the gentleman; I was speaking in round numbers. The importations for the month of March included \$111,000,000 worth on the free list and \$70,000,000 worth paid duty; 62½ per cent of all our imports were on the free list.

Gentlemen, I want to point out to you some of the Democratic inconsistencies in reference to the employment of child labor abroad. I have here a letter from the American consul at Bradford, England, Mr. August E. Ingram, dated April 22, 1914. I wrote him asking him to give me some statistics as to the employment of child labor in the factories of England, and here is what he said in part:

The annual report of the juvenile employment committee—their first report—has, among other things, some interesting tables; while the three pamphlets or handbooks in regard to (1) the woolen and worsted trade, (2) the engineering trade, and (3) the professions, give, especially the first and second, some of the very statistics that you wish. I also send you a copy of the report of the Bradford education committee for the year ended July 31, 1913, which, on page 71, gives the number of so-called "half-timers"—that is, children who, having reached the age of 13 and being in a certain prescribed standard or grade, are permitted to work half time at some employment, attending school the other half of the day. The number of such half-timers in Bradford is, according to the latest return, 5,161, while the total for England is, according to a recent newspaper statement, 70,255. Bradford is said to head the list of all cities in the country for half-time or child labor, the spinning mills apparently finding their labor most desirable, although various automatic doffing mechanisms are now on the market.

There is at the present time a bill pending in Parliament amending the law in respect to the employment of children and their attendance at school. As yet, I have been unable to learn much about it beyond various statements in the newspapers. Among other things, I read that in Scotland half-time labor does not exist, and the bill also proposes to follow Scotland's example in establishing compulsory attendance at evening schools. I also read that at a meeting in London on child employment it was stated that children 3 or 4 years of age were employed sewing or linking hooks and eyes on cards; 5 years old were employed fitting covers on boxes; and there were thousands of children but a few years older than this in Birmingham, Nottingham, and the East End of London, who are regular wage earners.

At a conference of the Workers' Educational Association (north-western district) held recently in Bradford, Mr. Frederic Keeling, of London, who was introduced as the leading authority on the question of the employment of children, said in the course of an address that 2,250,000 boys and girls under 18 years of age were working for wages in this country. Of these about 240,000 were children attending school full time and working out of school hours, as milk boys, newsboys, street traders, etc. In regard to "blind-alley" employment, he said that 300,000 or 400,000 boys were working at jobs in which they would not be wanted after reaching the age of 16 or 17 years.

Mr. Keeling has just issued a very complete historical account of the attempts to restrict and regulate child labor in the United Kingdom; and in view of your interest in the matter I have ordered a copy of it and will send it to you by the next mail.

And yet you Democrats remove a protective tariff and encourage the importation of the product of this foreign cheap child labor employed in Europe, but continue to claim you are a friend of labor in this country. Are you consistent? You are an enemy of our laborers by your action in this matter.

On the 28th of April Mr. Ingram again wrote me, and he gives me the employment of children, taken from statistics furnished by the English Government. In part, he said:

SIR: I now beg to give you the following statistics taken from Volume X, Part II, of the series of Official Blue Books, tabulating the results of the 1911 census of England and Wales, issued last December:

1. As to the number of males and females from 10 to 16 years of age engaged in occupations, which includes domestic service:

	Years.				Total.
	10-13.	13-14.	14-15.	15-16.	
Males.....	21,583	75,561	222,854	278,275	598,273
Females.....	10,243	39,033	133,217	193,285	375,778

2. The total number of males and females of all ages engaged in occupations was given as follows:

Males.....	11,453,665
Females:	
Unmarried.....	3,739,532
Married.....	680,191
Widowed.....	411,011
	4,830,734

3. The total number of persons occupied and unoccupied was stated as follows:

	Males.	Females.
All ages.....	17,445,603	18,624,884
Under 10 years.....	3,783,403	3,767,771
10 years and upward.....	13,662,200	14,857,113

The statistics of occupation for the textile manufacturers of England and Wales are as follows:

	Ages.				Total.	Total of all ages.
	10-13.	13-14.	14-15.	15-16.		
Males.....	8,169	14,167	17,035	15,974	55,345	400,474
Females.....	8,833	19,948	30,617	33,478	92,876	642,011

The wages paid in Europe and in the Orient run from 20 to 88 cents per day, and yet my Democratic friends have voted to remove the duty on cotton below the protective point, so that it will bring into competition with American labor the products of labor receiving that rate of wage.

I am going to show you now what the effect has been. Here is a statement furnished to the Ways and Means Committee one year ago by a firm that has factories and manufactures mohair and alpaca goods in this country, and also at Bradford, England. The one located in this country is at Greystone, R. I. I shall not undertake to detail the wages paid, but they give the comparative wages for the different classes of labor in both their factories. The gentleman who furnished it was here to appeal to this Congress to maintain upon those goods a protective tariff, otherwise his firm would have to close their factory at Greystone, where they have a million and a half dollars invested, and furnish us with the articles they produce in Bradford, England. Their wages averaged in England 40 per cent of the wages paid by them at Greystone, R. I.

I have here a list of certain articles that were imported during the month of March—cotton, dress goods, lining, yarns, silk, wool tops, oils, sheepskins, carpets, mohair; and several other things are included. During March, 1913, under the old law there were \$800,000 worth of these particular goods imported, and under this law, in March, 1914, there were \$3,083,000 worth imported, or an increase of importations of \$2,283,000 for one month alone. The money sent abroad to buy this great increase in importation at \$50 per month would give employment to 45,600 people here at home one month.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In referring to the increase in the importations the gentleman means simply on those specific articles?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield long enough to enable me to read a dispatch from San Francisco which appeared to-day?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Here is an Associated Press dispatch:

SAN FRANCISCO, May 8.

The steamship *Benefactor*, due here from the United Kingdom in 10 days, is laden with 11,950 boxes of tin plate.

No other extensive importations of tin plate have been made since the institution of the tin-plate industry in the United States.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; that industry shows 650 per cent increase in importations in one month.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman has enumerated the increase in the various articles, and the increase in some of them has been very large. Can he tell the membership of the committee wherein, if any, there have been any reductions in the retail prices of these various articles?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know of any reductions, but I will tell the gentleman what the duty on tin plates was under the Payne tariff law. It was 1½ cents per pound, or \$1.20 a hundred pounds. Under this new tariff law the duty is 15 per cent ad valorem, and when valued at 3 cents a pound, with 15 per cent ad valorem, the duty collected amounts to 45 cents a hundred pounds as against \$1.20 under the old law, and if tin plate was selling at 4 cents a pound, 15 per cent ad valorem would be six-tenths of a cent per pound, or 60 cents a hundred pounds, which is one-half the duty under the Payne tariff law. That reduction of duty has brought the duty down below the protective point, and we are now consuming Welsh tin instead of having tin made in our factories in this country. This low duty permits the importation of foreign tin plate.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I was trying to find out from the gentleman how much, if any, of the promised reductions had been made to the consumer.

Mr. FORDNEY. None that I have heard of to the ultimate consumer. Leather goods, gloves, paper manufactures, manufactures of silk, vegetables, wool and woolen goods, and so forth, show in the total of all of these articles an average increase in importation of 64.2 per cent. The importations for the month of February were \$25,198,000, as compared with \$15,000,000 last year, or an increase in importations of \$9,861,000. We sent that much money abroad to buy an increased quantity of those goods over the amount we sent out last year for the same purpose; and if that increased exportation of money had been kept at home and given employment to American laboring men, it would have furnished employment, at \$50 per month, for 197,232 men one month. We will find enough unemployed by and by, so that the gentleman from Ohio can get some men for his farm, I guess.

I received a letter on April 23, written by Mr. Gary, president of the United States Steel Corporation, in reply to a letter I wrote him to find out business conditions with that company. He very kindly gave me a complete statement of the number of men employed and the wages paid and the percentage of business done by his company compared with the total capacity of their factories since the organization of that company in 1901 down to date, and the lowest amount of their output produced in any one year was 74 per cent of their total capacity.

On the 15th day of April they had 29,000 men less in their employment than they had on the 1st day of October last year; 29,000 men at \$2.96 a day who are out of employment in that one company alone. The United States Steel Co. produces 44 per cent of all the steel produced in the United States, and if other steel factories of this country laid off a proportionate number of men, then there are 65,000 men out of employment in the steel industry who were employed on the 1st day of October, 1913.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There are some farm hands.

Mr. FORDNEY. There is some more labor, my Democratic friends, for your farms. Gentlemen, the amount of money paid, \$2.96 a day for the labor of 65,000 men, amounts to \$5,070,000 a month which is not now getting into circulation.

Now as to leather goods. The importations of leather goods under the old law were \$9,638,000 in six months of last year, and under the new law during the corresponding six months of this year \$13,814,000, an increase of \$4,176,000, which is the added money that was sent abroad by our people to pay for leather goods made by foreign labor; and if that money had been kept at home and given to American laboring men it would have employed 13,925 for six months at \$50 a month. Some more laborers for your farms, my Ohio friend. Now as

to the glove industry. The Democrats reduced the duty on ladies' gloves from \$2.25 per dozen pairs to \$1 per dozen pairs; men's gloves, \$4 per dozen pairs, were reduced to \$1 per dozen pairs. This has caused an increased importation in six months of \$1,125,000 worth of gloves, and if the laborers of this country had been given that money it would have furnished employment for 3,752 people for six months at \$2 a day, which is about the average wages paid in the glove factories. Now in regard to cotton, my friends. Cotton importations for five months increased \$2,600,000 in certain grades.

The labor employed in cotton mills receives about \$1.50 a day in the North and less than \$1 a day in the States south of the Mason-Dixon line, and if this money had been kept at home it would have furnished employment to 13,000 people at \$1.50 a day for five months. We import what is known as sea-island or Egyptian cotton, and we convert that raw material into the finished product in this country. We import it because it is a high-grade cotton and fine goods are made from it to better advantage than from our domestic short staple cotton. Last year we imported \$12,539,000 worth of raw sea-island or long staple cotton and converted it into the finished product with American labor, and the value added by manufacturing was more than equal to the cost of the raw material. There is no import duty on raw cotton, but you, my Democratic friends, reduced the duty on the finished products of cotton to such an extent that this year we imported only \$6,031,000 worth of raw cotton, a falling off of \$6,508,000. It is now being converted into the finished product by cheap labor abroad, because you reduced the duty on the finished product to a point so low that cheap labor abroad can produce it and bring it into this country at a less price than we can make it at the American scale of wages. If your party had not reduced the duty on the finished products below a protective point, this \$6,508,000 would have employed at home at \$1.50 per day 32,540 people for six months. I guess you can get enough laborers for your farms out of that number.

Mr. POST. The gentleman is overwhelming the farmer.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am telling the gentleman where he can get laborers for his farm. Now, when you compare conditions in England and in the United States in regard to the conditions of labor this is what you will find, and it is good evidence that we have been more prosperous during recent years under the protective policy than they have been in free-trade England. The census of 1910 shows we had 64,000 paupers in almshouses in this country, and in Yorkshire, England—where Bradford is located—the greatest manufacturing center, perhaps, in the world, there were 78,000 paupers in that one county alone, according to the English census of 1911. And in all England, where there are but 32,000,000 people, compared with our ninety-odd millions, there were 883,000 paupers. We have three times their population. Is not that evidence that the laboring class of that country has not been as prosperous as in this country? I think it is. It was stated by one gentleman who appeared before our committee last year—Mr. Parker, who is president of 16 cotton factories in North Carolina and South Carolina—that the cotton mills of this country could compete with the world. I asked Mr. Parker if it was true that labor in the cotton mills of the North received a higher standard of wages than was paid in the South in the cotton mills, and he said it was not.

I consulted the Tariff Board report and the census report and found this startling condition: In the cotton mills of South Carolina and North Carolina the wages averaged 86 cents a day, while in the cotton mills in the North Pennsylvania paid the highest wages of any cotton mills in any State of the Union, and the average rate north of the Mason-Dixon line was \$1.42 a day. Therefore the labor in the cotton mills of North Carolina and South Carolina received, according to the reports of the Tariff Board and the census report, 58 per cent of the wages paid for the same class of labor in the cotton mills of the North. Of course, Mr. Parker, of South Carolina, could live under free trade where the cotton manufacturers of the North could not.

Mr. POST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir; if you will be brief.

Mr. POST. Is the tariff responsible for the difference in price paid to those employed in the cotton mills of the South and the cotton mills of the North?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not say that at all. But I do say this: When Mr. Parker, of South Carolina, makes the statement that he can manufacture and compete with the cheapest labor in the world it should be remembered he pays but 86 cents a day to his laborers, whereas in the North wages are \$1.42 a day; and any man that would ask for legislation that would curse his neighbor and not permit him to live is nothing more nor less than a cannibal.

Importations of corn, oats, breadstuffs, potatoes, butter, animals, and eggs into this country are rapidly increasing, on account of the Democratic tariff law, as the following table shows:

Comparison of importations of seven leading agricultural products during six months of the Payne tariff law (October, 1913, to March, 1914) with six months under Underwood tariff law (October, 1913, to March, 1914).

Products.	Payne tariff act.	Underwood tariff act.
Corn.....	\$141,617	\$5,705,783
Oats.....	26,434	6,494,484
Breadstuffs.....	7,820,409	24,208,105
Potatoes.....	131,605	1,524,216
Butter.....	173,926	1,460,950
Animals.....	4,896,054	15,409,879
Total.....	13,190,046	55,623,479

Increased importations, \$42,433,433.

If this \$42,433,433 had gone to American labor, it would have given employment to 170,806 men at \$1.50 per day for six months.

The farmers of this country are going to remember you and the compliments you paid them when they take pencil and ballot in hand and go into the booths next fall. [Applause.] If they do not, they are bigger fools than I think they are. [Applause.]

Mr. CLAYPOOL. There is quite a discrepancy between wages paid in the North and in the South—

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLAYPOOL. And I wanted to ask, for information, how the gentleman accounts for that condition. Of course he can not account for it, as I understand the gentleman, on the protective-tariff theory; so how does he account for it?

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, it is a mighty difficult question to solve, but I will say this: Myself and business associates are employing men in the lumber woods in the State of Mississippi, and also in the State of Washington, on the Pacific coast, at the same kind of labor. On the Pacific coast we pay an average of \$3.26 a day, and in Mississippi we pay an average of \$1.77 a day. Can you tell me why that difference in wages should exist? The duty on lumber is measured with the same yardstick for the State of Washington as for the State of Mississippi. But the difference exists, and no human being can tell why.

Mr. GORMAN. Are the men in either of those sections identified with labor organizations?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, sir; they are not.

Mr. CLAYPOOL. The gentleman knows that the same difficulty as to difference in wages exists between Europe and America?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; the gentleman is mistaken. No such difference exists in any one European country—foreign wages are more uniform. One gentleman asked the question here why labor in free-trade England is higher than in protected Germany. I can give you one instance that may explain this question quite fully—the pottery industry. Abroad the female labor receives from 32 to 36 cents a day and male labor 80 to 86 cents per day. But there is a greater percentage of female and child labor employed there than here. In the South you have negro labor, the cheapest labor found in the United States, and perhaps that accounts for the lower wages paid in the cotton mills of the South.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to say to the gentleman that the negroes do not work in the cotton mills.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; they do. I have seen them. I have gone through cotton mills in the South and have seen them at work.

Mr. BARTLETT. They are employed in menial work. There is one cotton mill in South Carolina owned and operated by negroes, but the negroes do not work generally in the cotton mills of the South. The gentleman is mistaken as to that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not say on a large scale; but they are employed in the cotton mills at common labor.

Mr. BARTLETT. The question I was going to ask was as to the difference in the people employed in Mississippi and those in Washington. Those in Mississippi are colored people and those in Washington are not?

Mr. FORDNEY. About half of those in the South are white, and half of them are negroes—I am speaking of the lumber mills and camps—and between the wages of the negro and the white man for common labor there is no difference in Mississippi.

Mr. BARTLETT. You mean in your business?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir; in our business.

I wish to call your attention, gentlemen, to your Democratic platform—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Everybody knows all about that part you want to quote.

Mr. FORDNEY. You have a plank in your Baltimore platform declaring for free tolls for coastwise vessels going through the Panama Canal, which reads as follows:

We favor the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal.

Your platform further states:

Our platform is one of principles which we believe to be essential to our national welfare. Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign.

You now propose to repeal free tolls to our coastwise shipping—at the request of England.

Did you mean what you wrote in that platform? The other day I was out riding with a gentleman, and we went through a beautiful cemetery, in which there was a vault built by a noted man in public life. I said, "Why, that vault faces to the west, and when Gabriel comes from the east, blowing his trumpet, that man will face in the wrong direction." He turned to me and said, "My good friend, that man can change his position and meet Gabriel quickly; he can change his position as quickly and easily as Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic Party." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Woodrow Wilson, in public speeches delivered in 1912, promised the people of this country that if elected he would injure no legitimate industry. Did he mean what he said? If so, has he carried out his pledge? He signed a free-trade tariff law. You may call it what you please, but it is free trade, because that law has fixed duty rates below the point of protection, and thereby he has endangered or crippled to a very great extent our great agricultural industry of this country. He has also injured every legitimate factory in this country employing American labor.

Go to the lumber industry, gentlemen. There are 800,000 men employed in the sawmills of this country when running full blast, and about 25 per cent of those men are out of employment to-day, or, in round numbers, 200,000 who are idle. The average wage is about \$2 a day, making a loss of \$400,000 a day to our labor.

The duty removed from lumber alone does not affect that industry. If you had removed the duty on lumber and left it where it was—at a protective point—on all other products, it would not have affected the lumber industry so seriously; but by reducing the duty all along the line you have put out of employment a large number of American laboring men, reducing the value of the property and the products to be turned out and consumed. You have reduced the purchasing power of the people of this country, and all along the line the purchasing power of the people is less to-day than under the protective-tariff law. And it is going to go lower, as I fear, but I shall hope and pray with you that it does not.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Has the reduction of the tariff on lumber reduced the price to the consumer?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not in the retail business, but I was told by a retailer the other day that he had not changed his price to the consumer, although, as a manufacturer, we are selling lumber to-day at our mill in the State of Mississippi at \$5 a thousand lower than we sold for in March, 1913.

Mr. Chairman, how much more time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield.

Mr. POST. Are you selling your lumber at a loss now?

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, my friend, I will be candid with you. It is a question whether or not we are getting a new dollar for an old one. But there is another feature to be considered: We have 450 men in our employ in the lumber camps and mill. They are performing most faithful service. Those people represent a population of 1,800 or 2,000 men, women, and children.

If we close our mill to-day, where will those poor people turn to seek a livelihood? It is for me and my associates to consider seriously, sir, whether we will close down and throw out of employment those faithful servants, who have stood by us through thick and thin, when we can run without too serious a loss. We can not close our mill without a serious loss, for taxes, interest, insurance, and depreciation and certain overhead expenses

continue whether we are closed or running; and it is a question to-day—and I am candid about it—whether or not we are getting back a new dollar for an old one. But we are running and trying to avoid serious loss.

I have a report here from the Home Market Club, of Boston, which club gathers much statistics on the operation of woolen mills, and on the 2d day of March, out of all the mills reporting, 27 per cent of the looms were closed down. There are 168,000 employees in the woolen mills, and 27 per cent means 45,500 out of employment in that industry.

I can go on and show similar conditions existing all along the line. What is true of one industry is true of another. I regret exceedingly that we are not on the crest of a wave of prosperity. Capital can never be prosperous unless labor is well employed and prosperous, and the prosperity of American industries will reflect prosperity on all the people. No legislation should be enacted that will attempt to separate capital and labor. Class legislation is neither just nor equitable. It is contrary to the Constitution of the United States, my friends, to give one man prosperity and not others through legislation. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been used?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that the Chair has made a calculation, and after we have evened up the time there remains 1 hour and 13 minutes, so that it will give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] 12 minutes, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] 18 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] 43 minutes to close within the time that the House instructed the committee to close, namely, 4.35.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. All but 18 minutes. The gentleman has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] 12 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] 43 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. BARTLETT. How much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. Three hours and eleven minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] has used 2 hours and 46 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. I recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of some extracts from the speech of Col. George Harvey, editor of the North American Review, delivered before the Merchants' Club of Boston on April 21, 1914, entitled "Defense of the administration."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by the publication of the speech indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the speech referred to:

DEFENSE OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

(Extracts from the speech of Col. George Harvey, editor of the North American Review, before the Merchants' Club April 21, 1914.)

The last time I was in Boston I was on a political mission. It was in the summer of 1910 when, on returning from my native State, I met by appointment at the Hotel Touraine a gentleman, Woodrow Wilson, who had journeyed hither from his resting place on the banks of the Connecticut River. So it happened that I came from Vermont and he from Connecticut to this abode of political inspiration in Massachusetts, for the purpose of constructing a party platform for the use of Democrats in New Jersey. We struggled manfully at the task for two evenings, and, since I had comparatively small part in the actual construction of the document, I may say frankly with no little success.

In any case the doctrine enunciated, though anything but reactionary, proved so pleasing to the Jacksonians in New Jersey that I had little difficulty in inducing them to accept it, and in the following September the gentleman who had most to do with putting it into words was delegated to stand behind it as candidate for governor, and in due course of time was, as the current phrase runs, triumphantly elected. Thereupon, after having put those principles into active practice to the great satisfaction of the State, he was called up higher, and at present is shaping the course of the Nation from the Executive Mansion in Washington.

Of our foreign policies under this administration we may say, without undue boasting, that they are such as they are. Our attitude toward Mexico has not, of course, been to the liking of everybody in the United States or to anybody, apparently, in Mexico, except our amiable allies, Mr. Villa and Mr. Carranza. But how, I beg to inquire, could we make it more satisfactory or more consonant with international usage without virtually admitting that we had taken a false step at the beginning, a quite impossible confession, as all must agree. And have we not confounded the critics of watchful waiting by our

recent spirited action? Who now, in the face of 40 battleships steaming fearlessly before the frowning guns of the impregnable fortifications of Tampico, can attribute to us a craven spirit? I venture to say that as a result of that splendid maneuver the whole world has awakened to realization of the fact that we could, if we would, fight our way into that ancient village and capture it.

But it is no part of our purpose to utilize the strength of a giant simply because we possess it. We have no eager hope to engage in a bombardment which might conceivably result in frightful carnage through the bursting of a bottle of club soda upon one of our own battleships. To enhance our military glory is not our desire. That is not the problem. To salute or not to salute? That is the question to whose solution is being brought to bear all of the unsuspected resources of our diplomacy. As true Americans, devoted to the cause of peace and forbearance, let us hope and pray that the Mexican Government will not only accede to our gentle suggestion, but, what is more to the point, that it may be able to find somewhere in the vicinity of Tampico a cannon that can be fired 21 times without exploding. Else how can we anticipate that our Secretary of State will ever be able to place upon his brow the laurels of a world pacificator and clasp to his bosom the Nobel prize of \$40,000, the equivalent of \$6,000 full-paid subscriptions to the *Commoner*? But it is far from my intention to discuss our variegated Mexican policy at this time. I couldn't do it. I shouldn't know, at the moment, whether to laugh or to cry.

But while our composite democratic mind may at times seem to be closed, it is never really locked. We are always ready and willing to learn. No reasonable person, of course, could have expected us to recognize the de facto government of Mexico after we had once put our heel in the ground in refusal, but you may have noticed that subsequently when precisely similar conditions arose in Peru and Haiti we lost not a moment in according recognition to what was, even though it seemed to our higher thought what it ought not to be, thus disproving conclusively accusations of obduracy and inattention to the demands of expediency. Never again, you may rest assured, shall we fall into the error depicted by *Rameses II*, when, in giving instructions to the nephew who was to succeed him, he defined the difference between a diplomat and a lady.

"If a diplomat," he observed, "says yes he means perhaps; if he says perhaps he means no; if he says no he is no diplomat. On the other hand, if a lady says no she means perhaps; if she says perhaps she means yes; if she says yes she is no lady." You may be certain that we shall not soon again definitely, inflexibly, and irrevocably negative the designation of a President by another nation. As the colored gentleman about to be hanged remarked, somewhat pathetically, "This experience is going to be a mighty good lesson to me."

So far as our other diplomatic endeavors are concerned, we direct attention to the difference familiar to all between theory and practice. We denounced dollar diplomacy instinctively. The very word "dollar" grated harshly upon our tender sensibilities. We could hardly sleep o' nights while Mr. Knox was making a sordid trade with Nicaragua. And yet when, after having been placed in authority, we listened, as was our duty, to the pleadings of those unhappy neighbors, we not only confirmed the transaction, but voluntarily threw in \$3,000,000 to boot as evidence of good faith and kindly feeling, no less than of our own contempt for mere dross, so long as it can be extracted without undue attention from the Treasury of the United States.

So, too, with Colombia. There was a clear case of the pressing need of righting a wrong, and we are doing it or trying to do it after a fashion fully illustrative of our magnanimous disregard of millions. That the injury was inflicted and that reparation should be made there can be no question, but why it is necessary to take \$25,000,000 from our taxpayers, when but a few years ago \$10,000,000 would have been most gratefully accepted, and to couple with this payment an expression of regret closely approaching an apology for the action of a previous administration, along with the privilege of using our canal free of charge, may indeed seem to some as undue encroachment upon our generosity. So, at least, I am confident it will appear to the redoubtable huntsman whose comment upon his return we await with zestful anticipation.

Now for the tariff. We reformed the tariff not precisely as we reformed our Diplomatic Service, because we reduced it. That is what we promised to do. That is what we were elected to do. The precise degree of that reduction was not fixed during the campaign, and it must be admitted that we went somewhat beyond the terms of the bill which had already passed the Democratic House of Representatives. Some say even now, as Artemus Ward said of Napoleon, that we "tried to do too much and we did it." "People in Louisiana who are breaking their sugar machinery into junk and some of the beet growers in the West are talking that way, very much as the farmers voted at the recent congressional election in Iowa. But what of it? We had a principle to sustain and sustained it. The time may come, in fact it seems to be approaching, when we may need the \$50,000,000 of revenue so easily derived from the small tariff upon sugar, but if so, we have only to increase the income tax.

It is all quite simple and logical. Mayor Van Wyck insisted that Mr. Devery was the best chief of police New York ever had. And that is our attitude toward our new tariff. If it is not satisfactory from one point of view, it is from another. We Democrats have more than one string to our bow. Granting that the expectations of our optimistic Secretary of the Treasury are not being fully realized, then all we have to do is to fetch forward our ebullient Secretary of Commerce, with his proud assertion that our markets are not being filled with foreign products. In this way we are enabled to establish the soundness of our original contention regardless of the consequences. That is what we call team work. When one prediction fails, another is fulfilled beyond peradventure.

Occasionally we hear remarks of the dearth of employment for workmen in this section of the country. But there is nothing in that. You manufacturers are very prosperous. You may not know it, but you are. If you have any doubts upon the subject, we will send Mr. Redfield up here, and he will convince you by the exegetical process of reasoning that you are, or at least ought to be, which is the same thing. In any case, according to actual statistics in our possession, nearly 60 per cent of your working people are employed, and surely that is a very good percentage when you consider that you can not enact Democratic measures without expecting to get Democratic results.

The charge is brought against us Democrats that, although having for years professed an ardent desire for economy in the administration of public affairs, we are indulging in extravagance. This is a phase of our administration which for various reasons I do not care to dwell upon in detail. But as a slight indication of the baseness of the assertion, I would direct your attention to the fact that only the other day the Secretary of State appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and announced with pardonable pride that while he had

been conducting the affairs of his department with all the fire and dash of an angleworm, he had reduced the estimated expenditures of his department from \$354,160 to \$354,040, thus effecting a net saving of \$120 per annum. He achieved this reduction, moreover, without impairing the so-called efficiency of his force. Acting under the inspiration of his financial astuteness, by the simple method of dropping a clerk, who had been drawing \$900 a year, he was enabled to employ a footman, and added, somewhat pathetically, "You gentlemen, of course, know that you can not get along with a driver alone when engaged in the matter of returning cards." The Senators addressed nodded understandingly and, probably to show their own familiarity with the conventions, granted the allowance. So, too, finally did the House, though with less grace, because Representative Good, of Iowa, disliked the appellation "footman" and wished to substitute "messenger who shall act," etc. After Mr. Good's motion had succumbed to a point of order, Representative MURDOCK, of Kansas, objected to the appropriation for "equipment for drivers," which he insisted meant "livery and nothing else," and said emphatically, "I know the Secretary of State; I protest for him; I know the country from which he hails and its customs; we do not believe in that sort of thing out there." Nevertheless, since nobody seemed to know what is considered a suitable costume for a footman where footmen are unheard of and the only cards known are euchre decks, the protest passed unheeded and the appropriation was made with but one condition, that "equipment" should not comprise "skin-tight pants," thus completely demolishing the theory of the Peacham philosopher that "it's not the coat that makes the man, it's the pants."

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

[Mr. FARR addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CONNELLY].

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my admiration for some of these distinguished gentlemen who are opposed to old soldiers' pensions is so great and so genuine that I really regret that they take the position that they do regarding these old soldiers, who at best can have but few years to enjoy the largess of a nation's gratitude through the agency of their quarterly pensions.

I wish that I could vote for every dollar appropriated here with as good will and as clear a conception of duty done as I can when I cast my vote for these old soldiers' pensions. Mr. Chairman, I say this as a Democrat coming from a State that has been held in the Republican column for nearly half a century, largely through the influence and the vote of the soldiers of the Civil War. The politicians of my State have for years made every effort to hold this vote by appealing to the prejudice engendered in the war, and trying to make the old veterans believe that they were in danger of losing this stipend that comes to them from the Government should the Republican Party lose control. They have made the matter of pensions a partisan matter instead of placing it upon the high grounds that it should always occupy, that of being a patriotic matter. While a great majority of these old men in my district will to-day be found going to the polls and voting a different ticket from the one that I choose to vote, I may doubt their judgment but I never doubt their patriotism, and they have the right to vote as they desire. I have no respect for any man who views the pension matter from a partisan bias.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we are far enough this side of the great conflict that was all settled five years before I was born to look at the conditions now without viewing them through the smoked glasses of prejudice. There have been thousands of people who have grown up in my State who have not only believed but they have been encouraged to believe by men who were profiting by the old soldier vote that every Democrat was a rebel and at one time desired the dissolution of this Union. I had three uncles who heard the cry of their country's distress in the dark days of sixty-one. One of those uncles, a beardless boy, fell charging up the slopes at Fredericksburg; the other two came home, and, with honorable discharges, drew pensions until within the last two years, when they have crossed the silent river. They went to the war as Democrats, they came home Democrats, they lived and died Democrats. They believed that the Union should be preserved, but they never faltered in their devotions to the principles of Jefferson or doubted the wisdom of his teachings.

Mr. Chairman, these old soldiers have shown that they were loyal and patriotic, and they have the right to vote as they please, and they have the further right to expect this Government, under the administration of any party, great and rich and powerful as it is, to not refuse them food and shelter and raiment and medicine in their old age, as they totter down the last few years of the sharp decline of life's highway. Mr. Chairman, the lines drawn through the special bills that we have from time to time considered tell the story of the going of some of these old warriors while we are quibbling over a few paltry dollars that they have asked for to make smooth the last end of their journey here. Even while we stop in our deliberations the pontoons of death are heavy with the tread of their marching feet, marching to "Fame's eternal camping ground."

Mr. Chairman, I want to economize, and I know there are many places where it could well be done, but I do not want to begin at the expense of these old men, their wives and their widows. I would like to go back to my district and tell my people that this Congress had been careful with the people's money, but I do not want to say that we saved a dollar by taking it from the men who went down into the valley of the shadow when the lamp of the Nation's life flickered and all but went out. I want every soldier to know that this Nation has not forgotten and will not forget. I want him to know as he sits in the gloaming, in the twilight of the eventide, as he sits there in retrospect, as he hears the end of life's tollsome way—I want him to know that this Nation is not unmindful, is not ungrateful. I want this Nation to be just and, if you please, generous to these old men and their widows. I want this because I believe it their due, but I want it for another purpose as well.

I want the boy of the future who is just budding into stalwart manhood, if he should ever hear the blast that calls him to the defense of his country's flag—if he should say at that time, "Take my measure for a suit of the blue"—I want him to feel that in case he ever needs a few paltry dollars when he is old and poor and sick and discouraged, that this Nation will not be grudging in the granting. I am ready to stand by the side of the gentlemen here who are opposing the civil-service pensions for the men who have held good offices all their lives and who have drawn ample pay for the services they have rendered. It took no patriotism, no devotion, no sacrifice to accept the job and assume the responsibility. I want to be counted against that pension; but in every case where the committee finds that one of these old and decrepit veterans needs a few more dollars to tide him over the remaining span of life they can have my vote for him to have it. Some gentlemen have gone to the trouble to figure out that each one of the special pension bills sets the Nation back \$8,000. I have not the figures at hand, but I suppose they are in the main correct. If we pass 10 of these bills, the total will aggregate \$80,000 per year, or nearly 1 mill for each voter in the United States. Mr. Chairman, I want to be economical, but I do not want to save one-half of 1 cent for every family of five in my district at the price of ingratitude to these old men, their wives, and their widows. There is no class of people in this great Nation that is demanding it; there is no party nor creed who want it done. In the few years that he has yet to live under the friendly folds of the flag that he followed as his pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night let the old soldier vote the way he wants to vote, but let him understand that no vandal hand shall touch the little stipend that he draws in the shape of a quarterly pension from the Government upon whose altar he placed his all when the clouds of war hung low.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have before us to-day for consideration the annual pension appropriation bill, providing funds for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1914, and ending June 30, 1915. This is one of the largest appropriation bills that receives consideration and action by Congress each year. This time it contains an appropriation for the payment of annual pensions, and fees for examining surgeons, for the year mentioned in the sum of \$169,150,000.

It has always been a pleasure to me during my short career in this House to support by my vote the annual pension appropriation bills and other special bills providing pensions for the old soldiers and sailors, their widows and dependent children. This general pension appropriation bill I shall also with pleasure support and vote for. Observations and statistics show that there is a smaller percentage of pension appropriations wasted or misused than there is of any other Government appropriations of equal size. Experience and observation also show that there is no money appropriated by the Government which carries so much happiness and joy to the homes of our citizens as does the annual pension appropriation bill. No money appropriated by the Government is so equally distributed and kept so constantly in circulation. Of all the money that Congress annually appropriates none is so cheerfully and gratefully voted by the average Congressman, and none does as much substantial good among the people. These annual millions are divided, subdivided, and distributed among 800,294 pensioners upon the Nation's roll of honor.

ROLL OF HONOR.

The statistics for the last previous year indeed show it to be a roll of honor. In the annual distribution of these millions for pensions there is less waste and less fraud than in the appropriation and distribution of money by the Government for any other purpose. As evidence of the honesty, integrity, and honor of the old soldiers, their widows, and dependent children, let me present official statistics. It is shown by the records of the

Pension Bureau for the year ending June 30, 1913, that only 61 new cases for that year were presented by the bureau to the Department of Justice for prosecution on account of offenses against the pension laws. Where, I ask you, can there be found another 800,294 citizens with so little dishonesty and practicing so little deception and fraud? It shows us conclusively that honor and good character are precious to the old soldiers and sailors and their widows, and that they fight as valiantly to maintain and preserve untarnished the honor of their citizenship as they valiantly fought and battled for the honor and preservation of the Union; and yet some of our southern friends have the audacity to charge that the pension roll is not a roll of honor. Such indisputable facts prove conclusively that it is a roll of honor with a splendor not excelled by even the interior splendor of the Congressional Library, said to be the greatest splendor in the world.

CLASSES OF PENSIONERS.

Of the 820,200 pensioners on the roll at the close of the year ending June 30, 1913, 503,633 persons rendered service in the Army or Navy of the United, including 328 Army nurses, the remaining 316,567 being pensioned as widows and dependents. The number of individuals who served in the Army and Navy of the United States during the Civil War is estimated at 2,213,365.

The survivors of the Civil War on the roll on the 1st of July, 1912, numbered 497,263. These survivors at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1913, were, by death, reduced in number to 462,379, or a net loss during the year among the Civil War veterans of 34,884. This amounts to an annual reduction in the ranks of those heroes of 7½ per cent.

WIDOWS OF CIVIL WAR SOLDIERS.

On the 1st of July, 1912, there were 232,947 widows of Civil War veterans on the pension roll. On the 1st of July, 1913, there were 232,864 such widows on the pension roll, being a net loss of 83 during the last year.

WAR WITH SPAIN.

On the 1st of July, 1912, there were on the pension roll 23,841 survivors of the War with Spain, and 24,157 on the 30th of June, 1913. On the 1st of July, 1912, there were on the pension roll 2,931 widows of Spanish War soldiers, and at the end of that year there were 2,860 such widows on the roll.

The greatest number of pensioners ever carried on the rolls of the Government was 999,436 in the year 1902. The total amount paid in pensions for that year was \$141,335,646.95. The greatest amount of pensions ever paid in one year was in the year 1913, when the Government expended for that purpose \$176,714,907.39. It seems paradoxical that during the year 1913, when there were 179,246 less soldiers, widows, and dependents on the pension roll than in the year 1902, that the amount of pensions paid in 1913 should be \$35,379,050.44 larger than in 1902. An explanation, however, is simple and is due exclusively to the increase in pensions for Union soldiers provided for by the Sherwood age and service pension act, which became a law May 11, 1912.

NUMBER OF PENSIONERS AND ANNUAL AMOUNTS PAID.

The following table shows the total amounts paid for all pensions and the number of persons on the pension roll between the years 1902 and 1913, inclusive.

Number of pensioners and annual amount paid.

	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1901.....	\$138,531,483.84	\$3,868,795.44	\$142,400,279.28	997,735
1902.....	137,594,267.99	3,831,378.96	141,335,646.95	999,446
1903.....	137,789,653.71	3,993,216.79	141,782,870.50	996,545
1904.....	141,093,571.49	3,849,366.25	144,942,937.74	994,762
1905.....	141,142,861.33	3,721,832.82	144,864,694.15	998,441
1906.....	139,000,288.25	3,523,269.51	142,523,557.76	985,971
1907.....	138,155,412.46	3,369,110.44	141,524,522.90	967,371
1908.....	153,093,086.27	2,800,963.36	155,894,049.63	951,687
1909.....	161,973,703.77	2,852,583.73	164,826,287.50	946,194
1910.....	159,974,036.08	2,657,673.86	162,631,709.94	921,083
1911.....	157,325,100.35	2,517,127.06	159,842,227.41	892,098
1912.....	152,986,433.72	2,448,857.31	155,435,291.03	660,294
1913.....	174,171,660.80	2,543,246.59	176,714,907.39	820,200

AMOUNT PAID TO PENSIONERS, 1790 TO 1913.

For the purpose of showing the almost unmeasured latitude of liberality of the Government for those who served in the Army and Navy during its existence the following table is submitted:

War of the Revolution (estimated).....	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension).....	45,823,014.46
Indian wars (service pension).....	12,241,273.61
War with Mexico (service pension).....	47,632,572.34
Civil War.....	4,204,536,944.47
War with Spain and Philippine Insurrection.....	42,185,230.84
Regular Establishment.....	28,461,369.52
Unclassified.....	16,499,419.44

Total..... 4,557,539,824.63

CLAIMS PENDING.

For the purpose of showing that the Pension Bureau has before it other work than the mere payment of pensions, I desire to submit the following table, showing the number of claims pending before that bureau on the 1st of July, 1913:

Civil War.....	73,089
War with Spain.....	6,973
Mexican War.....	241
Indian wars.....	179
War of 1812.....	3
Old wars.....	9
Regular Establishment.....	3,087
Total.....	83,581

WISCONSIN CIVIL WAR SOLDIERS.

During the year ending June 30, 1913, there was paid to 19,176 soldiers, their widows and dependents, residing in the State of Wisconsin, \$4,199,038.08. In the amount of pensions paid to citizens by the Federal Government, Wisconsin ranks eleventh among the several States.

SPECIAL ACTS.

Since 1861 there has been allowed by special acts of Congress 42,337 pensions and increases of pensions, of which 22,016 are now on the roll, with an annual face value of \$6,699,096. Only a part of this is properly chargeable to special acts, as most of the beneficiaries had been previously pensioned under general laws at lower rates.

From June 30, 1912, and thereafter, during the Sixty-second Congress, 2,871 persons were included in the special acts passed at the rates specified in the summary following:

Pensions granted by special act during the Sixty-second Congress, subsequent to June 30, 1912.

Rates specified.	Number granted.	Rates specified.	Number granted.	Rates specified.	Number granted.
\$100.....	3	\$20.....	398	Inoperative:	
\$50.....	98	\$18.....	6	\$50.....	8
\$46.....	1	\$17.....	6	\$40.....	4
\$45.....	2	\$16.....	32	\$36.....	9
\$40.....	116	\$15.....	20	\$30.....	33
\$36.....	164	\$14.....	2	\$24.....	16
\$35.....	2	\$12.....	403	\$20.....	3
\$30.....	672	\$10.....	15	\$16.....	4
\$25.....	16	\$8.....	9	\$12.....	4
\$24.....	518	\$6.....	7		
				Total.....	2,871

Since 1899 the different Congresses have passed the following number of special pension acts during each Congress:

	Special acts.
Fifty-sixth Congress, 1899-1901.....	1,391
Fifty-seventh Congress, 1901-1903.....	2,171
Fifty-eighth Congress, 1903-1905.....	3,355
Fifty-ninth Congress, 1905-1907.....	6,030
Sixtieth Congress, 1907-1909.....	6,600
Sixty-first Congress, 1909-1911.....	9,640
Sixty-second Congress, 1911-1913.....	6,350

Total number of special acts passed by Congress in 14 years..... 35,546

It is impossible at this time to tell the exact number of special pension acts which will be passed during this session of Congress, but to me it appears that such acts are being passed, at least as liberally as during the Sixty-second Congress subsequent to June 30, 1912, when the Sherwood Pension Act was in force. The reason why the number of special pension acts passed by this Congress will not be as great as in the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses is because of the liberal provisions of the Sherwood General Pension Act taking care of thousands of needy and destitute soldiers whom it otherwise would have been necessary to have taken care of by special pension acts. The ravages of age and disease, however, are naturally working with great havoc and rapidly among the old soldiers and sailors. Nearly all are now incapacitated from performing manual or other labor, and a large portion of them, like the rest of mankind, have been unsuccessful in laying aside provisions for a rainy day, and the number who are in needy and destitute circumstances is rapidly growing. It will therefore be absolutely necessary to continue until the last soldiers have answered the final bugle call the practice of passing special pension acts by Congress granting relief to those who may be in the most helpless, dependent, and destitute circumstances. Of course there are many persons in and out of Congress who complain of the increased liberality necessary in the future to be made in the case of pensions.

Some gentlemen, especially those from the South, claim that the pension system is costing too much. I do not know what the future demands upon the Nation's gratitude will be. I

shall not stop to count the cost. My only question will be, Do they need it; and if so, how much? If they do, and it stands to reason that they will, I am willing to give it to them, regardless of its cost. We will then show the nations of the world that this Republic, at least, is not ungrateful, nor forgetful of its defenders. To those who are worrying about the increased cost, let them remember that at every period of the expansion of our pension policy there has been worry and objections to every increase in pensions, and yet the country has been able at all times to meet its debt of gratitude, to fulfill its governmental obligations, and to prosper. Let them remember that every dollar that the Government spends for pensions makes the Government just so much stronger in the affections of its citizens. The money goes into every avenue of trade, and into every section of the country. It is true that larger amounts may go into certain sections of the country than others, but there are well-established historical reasons why the amount of pensions distributed in our Southern States is smaller than the amount thereof spent in the North, East, and West. In numerous cases the distribution of pensions under our present system saves the old soldier or sailor or his widow from State, county, or municipal charity. Nothing could be sadder than to see one of the Nation's heroes dependent upon public or private charity. Loyal and patriotic Americans of all political parties are determined that such shall not be the sad lot of any of the Nation's defenders.

Every loyal, patriotic, and grateful American approves of the liberal granting of pensions to our old soldiers and sailors, their widows and minor children and dependents. No government, whether a monarchy or republic, has ever treated its soldiers and sailors and their dependents as liberally as this Government has treated its soldiers and sailors, their widows, and their dependents. Those who fought and bled for the Nation in time of war, and their widows and dependents, are worthy of their country's gratitude, and with the advance of their years and inability to labor, the Nation's gratitude and affection should be increased and not diminished.

DEMOCRATIC FRIENDS OF SOLDIERS.

Some of our opponents, however, may be disposed to contend and assert that the solicitude and gratitude of the Democratic Party for the old Union soldiers has but recently been born, or may be prompted by other than reasons of gratitude to the Union soldiers.

Permit me to here insert a list of the various pension laws which were either approved by a Democratic President or passed by a Democratic House of Representatives. Legislative history proves what I now here credit to the Democratic Party:

First, Act of August 15, 1876, providing for the issuance of artificial limbs, or commutation therefor, to disabled soldiers and seamen, and providing transportation for the purpose of having the same properly fitted.

Second, Act of February 28, 1877, increasing the pension of those who lost both an arm and a leg.

Third, An act of March 9, 1878, granting pensions on account of service in the War of 1812 and the Revolutionary War, requiring a service of but 14 instead of 60 days on the part of the survivors of the War of 1812, and granting pensions to widows, regardless of the date of the marriage to the soldiers of this war. It also granted pensions to widows of soldiers of the Revolutionary War on a service of 14 days. Former laws required a marriage prior to the treaty of peace in the case of widows of the War of 1812.

Fourth, Act of June 17, 1878, increasing to \$72 per month the pensions of those who lost both hands, both feet, or the sight of both eyes incident to the service.

Fifth, Act of March 3, 1879, increasing to \$37.50 all pensions on account of amputation at the hip joint. This sum was afterwards increased to \$45 per month by a Democratic House.

Sixth, Acts of January 25 and March 3, 1879, granting arrears of pensions from the date of discharge, generous measures which benefited more than 225,000 pensioners at once and caused the annual pension rate to leap from \$33,708,526.19 to \$57,240,540.14. The Republican Party had control of both Houses of Congress for more than 10 years after the close of the war, but passed no legislation of this character.

Seventh, Act of June 21, 1879, abolishing biennial medical examinations and providing that in no case shall a pension be withdrawn or reduced except upon notice to the pensioner and a hearing upon sworn testimony.

Eighth, Act of June 16, 1880, giving \$72 per month to all those who became totally helpless for any cause incident to the service.

Ninth, Act of February 26, 1881, for the protection of pensioners in the soldiers' homes.

Tenth, Act of July 4, 1884, which established the proper relation which should exist between attorneys and clients and fixed by law the fees to be allowed in pension cases. By this act a Democratic Congress placed the strong arm of the law between the helpless applicant and the rapacious agent.

Eleventh, Act of July 14, 1892, establishing an intermediate rate of pensions between \$30 and \$72 per month, and fixing the rate of \$50 for all who required frequent and periodical though not regular and constant personal aid and attention.

Twelfth, Act of August 5, 1892, granting pensions to Army nurses and forbidding the demanding of a fee by claim agents for prosecuting this class of cases. This was a generous recognition of the noble heroines who, leaving home and loved ones behind, in self-sacrifice braved pestilence and hardship to minister to the sick in the hospitals of the Army.

Thirteenth. Act of December 21, 1893, making a pension a vested right.

Fourteenth. Act of April 18, 1884, making it a felony for any person to falsely or fraudulently represent himself to be an officer of the United States.

Fifteenth. Act of March 19, 1886, increasing from \$8 to \$12 per month the pensions of 79,989 widows and dependents on the roll at the time as well as tens of thousands who have since been placed thereon. These certificates were issued by a Democratic Commissioner of Pensions, without any expense or unnecessary delay to those deserving beneficiaries.

Sixteenth. Act of May 17, 1886, amending the reports of the War Department, which discriminated against a large and worthy class of soldiers, relieving thousands of unfortunate veterans of the hardships worked by the resting of the charges against them, based upon technical errors in the records.

Seventeenth. Act of August 4, 1886, increasing the pensions of 10,030 cripples—armless and legless veterans.

Eighteenth. Act of January 29, 1887, benefiting about 30,000 survivors and widows of the Mexican War.

Nineteenth. Act of June 7, 1888, granting arrears to widows from the date of the death of the husband and providing that all United States officials authorized to administer oaths should administer all oaths required to be made in pension cases in the execution of vouchers for pensions free of charge. This arrearage act benefited at once more than 200,000 soldiers' widows.

Twentieth. Act of August 27, 1888, increasing pensions on account of deafness.

Twenty-first. Act of February 12, 1889, granting an increase of pension from \$72 to \$100 per month to all persons who lost both hands in the service and line of duty.

Twenty-second. Act of March 1, 1889, relating to the payment of pensions to widows or dependent heirs where subsequent to the issue of the check the pensioner dies.

Twenty-third. Act of March 2, 1889, removing certain technical charges in the record and relieving a large and meritorious class of soldiers.

Twenty-fourth. Act of March 2, 1895, which abolished the rate of \$2 and \$4 and fixed the lowest rate of pension at \$6 per month.

Twenty-fifth. An act of May 11, 1912, granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War, increasing the pension of more than 400,000 soldiers, and which is the best pension law ever enacted by Congress, thereby increasing the annual pension roll from \$153,686,500 to \$180,240,145.84.

SHERWOOD PENSION BILL.

On the first day of the special session of the Sixty-second Congress, being the 4th day of April, 1911, that gallant old soldier Democrat, Gen. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, chairman of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions, introduced the first bill of the session, H. R. 1, providing a general increase of pensions to Civil War veterans based upon service. This bill, in modified form, subsequently became a law on the 11th of May, 1912, and now constitutes the new general pension law, based upon age and service. The Sherwood bill, as introduced and as passed by the House of Representatives in December, 1911, was a far more liberal and just bill than it was, after it had been amended by the Republican Senate.

The Sherwood bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, provided that any soldier or sailor who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor, through causes not due to his own vicious habits, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability, is now unable to perform manual labor shall be entitled to a pension of \$30 per month. If this bill had become a law as it passed the House of Representatives it would have been a far more liberal pension bill than the present general pension law, and would have given greater satisfaction to the ex-Union soldiers and sailors. Under its terms every such soldier or sailor, who had been wounded in battle or in line of duty or was disabled from diseases contracted in the service, would have been entitled to a maximum pension of \$30 per month, regardless of other causes, like old age, accidents, or other diseases contracted since his service, and now rendering the soldier or sailor unable to perform manual labor. In other words, his maximum pensionable disability would not have been based upon present disabilities arising from diseases of service origin only.

The Secretary of the Interior, at the time that the Sherwood bill was pending, estimated that at least 15,000 old soldiers and sailors would be benefited by this \$30 per month disability clause. The increase in disbursements under this clause was estimated not to exceed \$2,500,000 per year. It was truly stated that if the bill became a law with this maximum disability clause that it would necessitate an examination of every applicant for the maximum pension by an examining surgeon, or a board of examining surgeons, and that the increased cost due to such medical examinations would probably reach \$200,000 a year. This supposed increase in expenses of medical examinations would have been a mere trifle as compared with the great relief that would have been provided for and shared in by the old soldiers and sailors by the disbursement of \$2,500,000 more annually among 15,000 of their number.

In the Senate in 1912, during that same session of Congress, the Sherwood pension bill was amended by inserting in lieu of the language above cited the following:

That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty resulting in his disability, is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid the maximum pension under this act, to wit, \$30 per month without regard to length of service or age.

It will thus be seen that the Senate amendment based the right of the soldier or sailor to \$30 per month pension upon his present inability to perform manual labor because of wounds, injuries, or diseases incurred in the war exclusively, and did not take into consideration, as did the original Sherwood bill, other causes besides those of service origin, which might aggravate and contribute to the present inability of an old soldier or sailor to perform manual labor.

Various attempts have been made in the Pension Bureau to have that bureau construe this clause in the present pension law, so as to give the old soldiers and sailors the benefit of the \$30 per month maximum pension as was intended by the original Sherwood bill. There are many arguments that can be advanced in favor of such a construction, but the bureau, consistent with its past record for years, has given the benefit of the doubt to the Government and against the old soldiers. This is a construction which is undoubtedly inconsistent with the purposes of establishing a pension system, but it has become so firmly established in the Pension Bureau that argument against it is no longer of any avail, and the only relief that can be secured from the burdens of this wrongful rule of construction is by the passage of remedial legislation by Congress.

When we remember that the Sulloway general pension bill, after having passed the Republican House in the Sixty-first Congress, was finally killed in the Republican Senate of that Congress; and when we find that the Sherwood bill, introduced by a Democratic soldier and passed by a Democratic House in the Sixty-second Congress, was amended by the Republican Senate in that Congress so as to make it less liberal by \$2,500,000 each year, and so as to make this maximum pension applicable to 15,000 less soldiers and sailors, we can readily see that our Republican legislators are not always safely and consistently the best or most reliable champions and friends of the old soldiers and sailors.

These facts, as well as others, conclusively prove that the old soldiers' friends are not to be found entirely in any one party. They prove that their friends are to be found in all parties, and that those only are his friends who entertain patriotic sentiments and are therefore grateful to the defenders of their country.

History shows that there were times when partisan political exigencies were such that the Republican Party did not consider the time ripe for the liberalizing of pensions, as well as the Democratic Party found itself in such positions. But the old soldiers have always been reasonable and consistent in their pension demands, and can be safely relied upon to continue so.

Let me say in absolutely good faith and as their friend that it is not always wise for an old soldier to carry all of his eggs in one basket, for he has, and will continue to have, loyal friends in both parties. No fair and liberal minded Member of Congress should ever look upon pension matters from a partisan standpoint. In these days when the selfish and powerful money interests of the country are making a determined attempt to howl and cry down the amount of annual pensions, and actually abuse the friends of the old soldiers who vote for these necessary appropriations, it is well that the friends of the old soldiers should not know any party when they come to provide for soldiers and sailors' pensions. Let them ascertain the extent of the need of the Nation's defenders, and then without hesitation vote the amount of those needs.

SPECIAL PENSIONS OF THE SIXTY-SECOND AND SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESSES.

As a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions during the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses, I have had an opportunity of becoming familiar with the workings of that committee and the rules and spirit upon which such pension claims are weighed and considered. It is with pleasure that I can truthfully say that during the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses upon that committee there has been no exhibition of partisanship or sectionalism among the members in the consideration of claims. All claims coming before that committee are considered upon their actual merits. Entering into the merits are always the elements of age, service, need, and destitution of the soldier, his widow, or dependent. We sit and act as a court of equity in the true sense of the word. It is not necessary for a needy and destitute old soldier, or his widow, to

have the acquaintance of a Member of Congress, or to be recommended by some one of political or social prominence. The ear of every member of that committee is always open to the appeal of the weary, needy, and afflicted old soldier, or his widow. Acting as a court of equity, we are freer to act upon the merits of each claim than is the Bureau of Pensions. As in all courts of equity, technicalities which prevent the doing of justice are brushed away, and the course of justice allowed to flow freely. The work of that committee has been considerably reduced since the passage of the Sherwood general-pension law. We must, however, expect the work from now on to increase. This is due to the large number of old soldiers and sailors who will be reduced to needy and destitute circumstances by old age and inability to perform manual labor.

AUTOMATIC ADVANCES IN RATE OF PENSIONS.

Soon after the present general pension law, known as the Sherwood bill, went into operation, trouble was experienced in adjusting the rates to which each soldier and sailor claimant was entitled. It was easy for the Bureau of Pensions to ascertain from its records the exact length of each soldier and sailor's service in the Army or Navy. It was, however, a far more difficult matter to determine the exact age of each such soldier or sailor. In many instances it was found that the applicant for a pension under this law was uncertain as to his own age or date of birth. In many instances where this was the case, the soldier or sailor was also without available means for ascertaining the same. In many instances soldiers and sailors had, in previous applications and communications to the Pension Bureau, carelessly and inaccurately stated their age and the date of their birth under oath. Those previous affidavits and communications were made at a time when neither the department nor the soldier or sailors were interested in his birth or age. Consequently that question was then immaterial. But, as the amount of pension under the Sherwood pension bill depends upon age as well as service, it became necessary and important, both to the Government and the soldier or sailor, that his exact age should be determined in the allowance of his application for a pension under that law. In a large percentage of cases it was found that the soldier or sailor had made in the past conflicting statements as to the date of his birth and his age, and the bureau would compel him to resort to all kinds of evidence to prove the date of his birth.

In many such instances his application under that act was allowed without determining the exact date of his birth or his exact age. For instance, if he claimed to be 73 years of age, if the different affidavits made by him in the past all showed that he had represented himself as being of such an age that at the time of the application, according to previous affidavits, that he would be 71, 72, or 73 years of age, without determining his exact age, the bureau at that time would allow him the rate of pension provided for a soldier of his service who had reached the age of 70 years, because, according to all affidavits, he was then over 70 years of age, and entitled to the rate of pension provided for a given service and that age. Soldiers and sailors whose claims were allowed under such conditions will be required, before their next claim for increase on account of age will be allowed, to prove definitely and positively the date of their birth.

Since the discovery of this troublesome situation Congress passed, March 4, 1913, an amendment which, in substance, provides that when a soldier's or sailor's claim under this law has been passed upon and allowed, and his exact age once determined, there shall be kept a record in the Pension Bureau showing the name, length of service, and age of each claimant and date of his birth, the monthly rate of pension granted to or received by him, and the county and State of his residence, and that further increases in the rate of pension under that act on account of advancing age shall be made without further application by the pensioner and shall take effect and commence from the date he is shown by the aforesaid record to have attained the age provided by the act as a period for advancing said rate, the object of this being to advance the rate of pensions automatically, as provided in the Sherwood pension bill, without expense to the pensioner, and by requiring the Commissioner of Pensions and his office force to take judicial notice of the recorded evidence of the date of each pensioner's birth when once established. This law is working very satisfactorily, but there are still many instances in which it is necessary for the pensioner to supply satisfactory evidence of his age before he will be automatically allowed an advance in his pension rate. But once the age of a pensioner has been determined to the satisfaction of the bureau, it will not be necessary for the pensioner to again submit any such proof or to be delayed in the regular receipt of his pension.

MONTHLY PAYMENTS.

The question of providing for monthly payment of pensions, instead of quarterly payments, has received some attention at the hands of Congress during this session. A number of bills for that purpose have been introduced, some of which have been considered. It would appear at first that every pensioner would be in favor of this movement, yet such does not seem to be the case. The old soldiers themselves have manifested but little interest in the proposed change. There appears, however, to be a great division of sentiment among them in certain sections of the country. In other sections no interest, pro or con, has been manifested.

It appears that the executive council of the National Grand Army of the Republic, which council is the highest body next to the grand encampment itself, at the national encampment held at Chattanooga, after such proposed change had been discussed during the address of the commander in chief, unanimously decided against monthly pension payments.

The present Commissioner of Pensions professes that originally he was in favor of the monthly payment of pensions, but since considering the subject and investigating the sentiment among the old soldiers he finds that there is at present no sufficient demand to justify the change. He appears to be now somewhat against the movement, owing to the additional expense which it will involve and the seeming indifference of pensioners.

The additional expense is estimated by him at \$1,000,000 per annum. I can not, however, bring myself to believe that there is any substantial foundation whatsoever for any such high estimate of additional expense. I am reliably informed that the present expense of paying pensions by checks under the present system of paying quarterly, or four times a year, is only \$100,000. If that be true, then expense of monthly payments would be four times that, or \$400,000, a mere bagatelle to the Nation, providing that the change is desired. The subject seems to be new, and perhaps the idea of such a change has not as yet been fully discussed and considered among the old soldiers. They and their friends, however, can rely upon the assurance that whenever they manifest a majority, or strong desire for the change, that Congress will readily grant the same.

LOST CHECKS.

Among the various bills introduced at this session of Congress for the relief of the old soldiers is one for the issuing of duplicates of lost pension checks. The present law requires that when a pension check has been lost, or mislaid, or accidentally destroyed, that application may be made for a duplicate, which, upon the filing of a bond by the pensioner, will be issued at the end of six months. This is an unnecessary hardship upon the old soldier, who has been so unfortunate as to not receive his check or who has lost the same.

A bill providing that these duplicate checks in place of lost checks shall be issued 30 days after filing an application therefor has been favorably reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and there is every reason to believe that it will pass Congress unanimously when it is reached upon the calendar.

SOLDIER SHOULD HAVE BENEFIT OF DOUBT.

The entire history and practice of the Pension Bureau shows that in nearly every instance all technicalities are resolved in favor of the Government and against the soldier or sailor. It further shows that in nearly every instance the Government has been given the benefit of the doubt, and as a result the soldier or sailor got the worst of it. This rule of construction and procedure may have been justified years ago when the pension law relating to Civil War soldiers and sailors was in its infancy. At this late date, however, when the soldiers' and sailors' comrades are scattered to the four winds and can not be found, when others are dead, when age has dimmed the memory of others, when the securing of evidence is most difficult, and when the soldier or sailor is most in need of a pension from the Government, it is time that this rule of construction and of solving technicalities should be changed, and the benefit of the doubt and the solving of technicalities should be in favor of the soldier, sailor, or his widow.

Again, the Pension Bureau seems to be working in some ruts of past ages in other respects. If that bureau would divert or turn from some of these old traveled ruts or routes, justice would be done the old soldier and sailor much quicker than it is done at present and more often. That bureau seems to have the audacity to even question acts of Congress, especially in the case of special pension acts. Even attempts are sometimes made to refuse payment of special pension acts where there is a misspelling of the soldier's, sailor's, or widow's name, which does not change the sound of the name or the identity of the person, and where there is not the slightest evidence to lead

them to believe that the pensioner is any other than the person mentioned in the bill. Even a pension granted to a soldier, sailor, or widow by the full middle name by a special act of Congress is ignored and dishonored, because the name of the soldier, sailor, or widow may have originally appeared on the records by the full given name and the initial of the middle name. This happened in cases where there was absolutely no question as to the identity of the soldier or sailor. In the interest of justice to the old soldiers and sailors such quibbles and technicalities should be dispensed with.

WIDOWS MARRIED SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 27, 1890.

There are a few features of the present pension laws that are wrong, inequitable, and indefensible. Time will not permit me to discuss them in detail. In a short time, I expect, most of them will receive the careful attention of Congress. If once attention can be brought to them, I have no doubt but what justice will be done. The most unreasonable, arbitrary, and unjust provision in the pension laws at the present time is the one relating to granting pensions to widows who married subsequent to June 27, 1890. That act provides, among other things, a pension of \$12 per month for the widow of a soldier or sailor during her widowhood, provided that such widow shall have married her soldier or sailor husband prior to June 27, 1890. This act has been amended several times since, but this provision has never been amended or changed. There is now no law under which a widow who married since June 27, 1890, can secure a pension by law unless her soldier husband died of wounds or injuries inflicted during his war service or died from diseases contracted in such service. On the 27th of this coming June it will be 24 years since that harsh, unjustifiable, and arbitrary law was passed—nearly a quarter of a century.

It undoubtedly answered the purpose for which this arbitrary and inflexible date was fixed for a number of years after its passage. Under the strict letter of the law we may now have, on the one hand, a widow who married a soldier on the 24th of June, 1890, and on the other hand a widow who married another soldier on the 30th of June, 1890. One is entitled to a pension under the law at the bureau and the other is not. The husband of the widow marrying before the 27th of June, 1890, may have died a week after that date, and yet his widow is entitled to a pension under the law at the Pension Bureau. The husband of the other widow, who married him three days after the 27th of June, 1890, may die now, after she has lived with and cared for him as a faithful and devoted wife for 24 years, and yet under the law she is not entitled to a pension at the bureau.

This soldier's widow may have lived and struggled on with him during those 24 years in sorrow and in toil, in adversity and in poverty, from youth to old age, through storm and through sunshine, and it makes no difference for how many long, weary days and nights, through long years, she may have nursed him in his sickness and helplessness, nor that in sorrow and tears she spends her last dollar to plant flowers on his grave, yet she is turned down at the Pension Bureau because of the provisions of this harsh, unjust, and arbitrary law. The fragrance of her dutiful and beautiful life has been wasted on the desert air. Justice demands that so long as we are to continue the policy of pensioning the widows of soldiers and sailors that this class of widows who married since June 27, 1890, should be afforded immediate relief and justice. It is true that the Committee on Invalid Pensions frequently recommends special bills in the case of very needy and destitute widows who married within a short time after the passage of that law. But the granting of a special bill to one of this class, when they all ought to enjoy this privilege as a lawful right, is a rank discrimination and an injustice to those who married no later and who have not been able to reach the sympathies of some Congressman.

BILL FOR RELIEF.

Having had this deplorable pension situation in mind for some time, and having closely noticed the injustice of its effects, I have had the pleasure during this session of Congress of introducing H. R. 15841, a bill to change the arbitrary provisions of the law of June 27, 1890, and to substitute therefor a more just and automatically working provision for widows.

In my bill I have stricken out from the present law the words—

Provided, That said widow shall have married such soldier or sailor prior to June 27, 1890—

And have substituted in lieu thereof the following words:

Provided, That said widow shall have married said soldier or sailor at least six years prior to the death of her husband soldier or husband sailor, and regardless of whether the death of said soldier or sailor shall have occurred before or may occur after the passage of this act:

And provided further, That no widow of a soldier or sailor, who shall become such widow after the passage of this act, shall be entitled to a pension under the provisions of section 2 of this act, unless she shall have attained the age of 50 years at the time of the death of her soldier or sailor husband.

I believe that when the injustice of the present widows' pension law is brought forcibly to the attention of this House, that some provision for relief will command its sympathies, and the result will be the passage of remedial legislation similar to that contained in the bill which I have introduced. I am sure that if you will but consider it, that its virtues will commend themselves to every one of you. The second provision in my new bill provides a guard against the alleged improper and immoral practices and impositions which it is said are sometimes practiced on the old soldiers and sailors by unscrupulous women. It contains a provision which automatically provides a pension for a widow who shall have resided with her soldier or sailor husband at least six years before his death. Of course, the provision of cohabitation with the soldier and the age of the widow at the time of his death are arbitrary and subject to change before the passage of the bill as the same may commend themselves to the favorable consideration of Congress.

I respectfully invite the careful consideration of this bill by Members of Congress, and by the old soldiers and sailors, their wives, and the widows of those deceased. I not only invite your consideration, but also your assistance in creating a proper interest and demand in this House for its passage or the passage of some similar bill by this House at its next regular session. There can be, and there is, no justification for the arbitrary method which now prevents a widow who has lived 24 years with her soldier or sailor husband from lawfully obtaining a pension at the bureau. It is true that it will increase the pension roll by several millions; but if it is right, and I believe it is, to continue the policy of pensioning soldiers' and sailors' widows, then there can be no excuse, apology, or justification for the present arbitrary discrimination between widows who married since June 27, 1890, and those who married before.

Let us do by these widows of Union soldiers and sailors what we have done in this Congress, within the last six weeks, for the widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain or in the Philippine Insurrection. That bill passed this House by a vote of three-quarters of those voting thereon in favor of it, and it contained a provision that a pensionable widow shall be one who has married an officer or enlisted man who served in one of those wars previous to the passage of that act. This is as it should be at present, but it is not as it should be in the future. It should contain a provision similar to that incorporated in the bill which I have introduced, providing that any widow who shall, after the passage of such act, marry an officer or enlisted man who served in such wars, shall be entitled to a pension of \$12 per month, providing she has been married to the soldier for six years or more before his death.

The hardships, cares, and sorrows endured by the widows who married since June 27, 1890, were and are naturally, on the average, greater and more severe by reason of the old age, helplessness, and inability of their soldier husbands, than were the hardships of those who married previous to that date. In conclusion, permit me to impress upon you that in the matter of widows' pensions, as well as in all legislation, there should be equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

[Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. AUSTIN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DAVIS. I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY].

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the membership of this House to some observations which I desire to submit on the "Pretensions of Great Britain to territorial rights in Central America" with respect to its bearing upon the Panama tolls controversy. I shall discuss it from a historical standpoint, having on another occasion given some attention to the interpretative features of the Clayton-Bulwer and Hay-Pauncefote treaties.

So much has been unwisely said, or inaccurately stated concerning the rights of the United States and Great Britain under the Clayton-Bulwer and Hay-Pauncefote treaties with respect to the Panama Canal, that a consideration of the underlying facts from which a proper conclusion may be based may well arrest public attention.

In his remarkable and able address before the United States Senate on January 21, 1913, Senator Root advanced his major premise for the British position on the tolls question, the in-

ducement or consideration for the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as follows:

Further than that, Great Britain was a Caribbean power. She had Bermuda and the Bahamas; she had Jamaica and Trinidad; she had the Windward Islands and the Leeward Islands; she had British Guiana and British Honduras; she had, moreover, the Mosquito Coast—a vast stretch of territory upon the eastern shore of Central America which included the river San Juan and the valley and harbor of San Juan de Nicaragua or Greytown. All men's minds then were concentrated upon the Nicaragua Canal route as they were until after the treaty of 1901 was made.

And thus when the United States turned its attention toward joining those coasts by the canal through the Isthmus it found Great Britain in possession of the eastern end of the route which men generally believed would be the most available route for the canal. Accordingly, the United States sought a treaty with Great Britain by which Great Britain should renounce the advantage which she had and admit the United States to equal participation with her in the control and the protection of a canal across the Isthmus. From that came the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Senator Root further said:

Your will observe, Mr. President, that under these provision—of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty—the United States gave up nothing that it then had. Its obligations were entirely looking to the future, and Great Britain gave up its rights under the protectorate over the Mosquito Coast, gave up its rights to what was supposed to be the eastern terminus of the canal. And, let me say without recurring to it again, under this treaty, after much discussion which ensued as to the meaning of its terms, Great Britain did surrender her rights to the Mosquito Coast.

Surely these are strong statements, which, if supported by exact history, would give Great Britain an equitable standing in the Panama controversy of much importance. Senator Root's assertions will not in all respects bear the scrutiny of historical or diplomatic research, and are the more remarkable when considered in the light of the fact that the United States never acquiesced in, but always protested against the flimsy title which Great Britain set up to a protectorate of the Mosquito Coast or sovereignty over any portion of Central America. Coincident with a renewal of interest throughout the United States in an interoceanic canal caused by the opening of the far West, Great Britain revived her long-abandoned claim over the Mosquito Coast. She broadened the confines of the Mosquito territory beyond the description of any map or records then extant, so as to include the ancient town of San Juan de Nicaragua, the eastern terminus of the then proposed Nicaraguan transoceanic canal. On January 1, 1848, a British force expelled the State of Nicaragua, hauled down the Nicaraguan flag, and raised the Mosquito flag in its place, changing the name of the town from San Juan de Nicaragua to Greytown.

The British establishment at Belize, the seizure of the island of Ruatan, belonging to Honduras, the encroachment of the English settlements, the seizure of the Tiger Island, on the Pacific side, were all in violation of Great Britain's treaties with Spain and in opposition to the then well-defined terms of the Monroe doctrine. It led the Government of the United States to make vigorous protests, for said Mr. Buchanan, while minister to London:

These proceedings gave birth to serious apprehension throughout the United States that Great Britain intended to monopolize for herself the control over the different routes between the Atlantic and Pacific, which, since the acquisition of California, had become of vital importance to the United States. Under this impression it was impossible that the American Government could any longer remain silent and acquiescing spectators of what was passing in Central America.

In 1848 Mr. Buchanan, then Secretary of State, gave instructions to Mr. Hise:

Under the assumed title of protector of the kingdom of the Mosquitoes, a miserable and degraded and insignificant tribe of Indians, she doubtless intends to acquire an absolute dominion over this vast extent of seacoast. With what little reason she advances this pretension appears from the convention between Great Britain and Spain signed at London on the 14th of July, 1786.

Whatever may have been the basis of Great Britain's claim in connection with the Mosquito Coast or of other portions of Central America, it is unnecessary to go back of 1783. After a long period of strife, the terms of settlement with Spain were incorporated in the treaty of 1783 and the treaty of 1786, under which Great Britain abandoned to Spain all claim of sovereignty over this territory.

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AINEY. Yes.

Mr. POST. I wish to suggest to the gentleman that Senator Root's contention was right to this extent, that at the time of the ratification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Great Britain had rights which she claimed in the Mosquito Coast, and in order to get rid of those rights it was necessary to enter into an agreement with Great Britain.

Mr. AINEY. Ah, the gentleman has failed to read with discrimination the diplomatic correspondence between this country and Great Britain. That treaty was entered into for the purpose of getting rid of Great Britain's flimsy pretension to such

rights, but not in recognition of them. For many years prior to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty this country voiced protest after protest against Great Britain's violations of the Monroe doctrine and violation of her treaties made with the Government of Spain, under which she had abrogated all claims to territorial rights in Central America.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AINEY. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania specify any considerations with which Great Britain parted for the making of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty? When the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was done away with, were not the two countries placed in statu quo, precisely as if there had never been any treaty before? And then, with what consideration did Great Britain part for the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty?

Mr. AINEY. I think that as I progress I shall fully answer the gentleman. I maintain in this statement that Great Britain had no rights in Central America or in the Mosquito Coast. Because she had no rights, there was no basis for the argument which the distinguished Senator advanced with respect to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AINEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should like to make this suggestion to the gentleman, that under the treaty that we had with Colombia in 1846, giving us the right to construct a canal across the Isthmus at Panama, how could Great Britain have lost anything by our carrying out that agreement, when we had a treaty with Colombia prior to the time that we executed the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which did not apply at all to Panama?

Mr. AINEY. I think the gentleman's suggestion is a very excellent one, but I trust that I shall not be led aside from the purpose of my remarks, which I propose to confine to the history of the claims of Great Britain to territorial rights in Central America and to the Mosquito Coast, and to show that Great Britain had by treaties and acts of Parliament long prior to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty abrogated all such claims.

Let me again call your attention to the fact that in 1783 Great Britain entered into a treaty with Spain, under article 4, of which she stipulated that with the exception of the territory between the river Belize and the Rio Hondo, within which permission was granted to British subjects to cut logwood—

All English who may be dispersed in any part of the Spanish continent ("continente Español") or in any of the islands whatsoever dependent on the aforesaid Spanish Government, and for whatsoever reason it might be, without exception, shall retire within the district above described in the space of 18 months from the exchange of the ratifications.

The treaty further provided that the permission to cut logwood "shall not be considered as derogating in any wise from his [Spanish Majesty's] right of sovereignty" over this logwood district, and it stipulated moreover that—

if any fortification should have been actually heretofore erected within the limits marked out, his Britannic Majesty shall cause them all to be demolished, and he will order his subjects not to build any new ones.

Notwithstanding the very plain terms of this treaty Great Britain questioned whether the Mosquito Coast was included. This led to the treaty of 1786, where even that quibble was settled. It provided:

His Britannic Majesty's subjects and the other colonists who have heretofore enjoyed the protection of England shall evacuate the country of the Mosquito as well as the continent in general and the islands adjacent, without exception, situate beyond the new limits prescribed by the convention within which British subjects were to be permitted to cut not only logwood but mahogany and all other wood—

and the Belize or logwood district was therein— indisputably acknowledged to belong of right to the Crown of Spain.

With this treaty there passed every semblance of legitimacy to Great Britain's claim to sovereignty on the Mosquito Coast or in Central America. A bare limited logging right without sovereignty was reserved to some of her citizens in Belize.

How did Great Britain again acquire her right to the Mosquito Coast and to British Honduras (Belize), which Senator Root says she surrendered under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in order that the United States might be admitted to equal participation with her (England) in the control and protection of the canal across the Isthmus?

By the treaty of Amiens (1801) Great Britain acquired the Island of Trinidad, South America, from Spain, but nothing more; nor did she acquire any Central American rights under the treaties of 1809 and 1814.

By act of Parliament (57 and 59 Geo. III) it was acknowledged that the British settlement at Belize was "not within the territory and dominion of His Majesty," but was merely

"a settlement for certain purposes in the possession and under the protection of His Majesty."

Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, in his letter to Mr. Dallas July 26, 1856, summarizes the whole matter:

Great Britain had not at the time of the convention of April 19, 1850 (the Clayton-Bulwer treaty), any rightful possessions in Central America save only the usufructuary settlement at the Belize.

Two objects were sought to be accomplished by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, 1850; one, the abandonment by Great Britain of her never admitted claim of right to the Mosquito and other Central American territory, and the other, the certainty of a speedily built canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific.

In 1848 California was acquired, but the Pacific coast was almost unknown and uncharted. The population of the United States was 23,000,000; our transcontinental railroads were yet unrealized; the demand was urgent for an Isthmian Canal. The United States could not then unaided undertake the construction of such an engineering project. England could provide the means; the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was entered into, with many assurances that British capital would be immediately offered.

England's unwarranted claim to the port and territory which controlled the Atlantic entrance to the proposed Nicaraguan route had been followed by her seizure of Tiger Island on the Pacific side. Thus Great Britain had attempted to bottle either end of the proposed canal. Under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, if plain language conveys meaning, her absurd contention to territorial rights on the Mosquito Coast was again abandoned.

Article 1 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was intended to sustain the American contention against the British territorial assumption in the Mosquito or other Central American country. The material portion, here italicized for emphasis, reads as follows:

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume, or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America; nor will either make use of any protection which either affords or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have to or with any State or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same.

Senator Roor says of this treaty, "after much discussion which ensued as to the meaning of its terms, Great Britain did surrender her rights to the Mosquito Coast."

Great Britain recognized that she had no rights in Central America or in Belize by an act of Parliament during the reign of George III, wherein it was acknowledged that the British settlement at Belize was "not within the territory and dominion of His Majesty," but was merely "a settlement for certain purposes in the possession and under the protection of His Majesty."

So the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was entered into, the purpose of it being, as set forth in the diplomatic correspondence, to settle favorably to our contention the claim which Great Britain had without the slightest foundation set up in violation of her solemn treaties and undertakings. This was the primary object of the treaty, and to build the canal across the Isthmus or across Central America was secondary.

Mr. Chairman, this is briefly the diplomatic history leading up to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Under it Great Britain, as she had ignored her treaties with Spain in 1783 and 1786, continued to exercise control in Central America and the Mosquito Coast. Finding from time to time technical grounds to avoid her obligations she never actually abandoned her possession until after the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, notwithstanding she had stipulated so to do. Under a claim of a protectorate over the Mosquito Coast, differentiating between the language "sovereignty" and "protectorate," she kept her hands on the territory which under several treaties and under an act of Parliament she had specifically admitted was not hers.

Senator Roor says of this treaty:

After much discussion, which ensued as to the meaning of its terms, Great Britain did surrender her rights to the Mosquito Coast.

It is difficult for the ordinary mind to conjure up a dispute as to the meaning of the treaty words under which the United States and Great Britain agreed "not to colonize or assume or exercise any jurisdiction over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America."

Notwithstanding this explicit language, the ingenuity of British diplomacy did conjure up an excuse for a continuance and enlargement of her Central American territorial contentions.

She attempted to differentiate between sovereignty and protectorship in the Mosquito territory, and she broadened her logging camp in Belize, which by treaty stipulation was limited in extent, and specifically without sovereignty, into a colony

which territorially covered an area as large as three of the smaller States of the Union.

By diplomatic representations and protests the American Government confronted Great Britain with the proposition that there could be no protectorate where there was not an underlying sovereignty; that an ignorant band of Indians, whatever their possessive rights to the land might be, could not exercise any rights of sovereignty over the same, and that the express terms of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty were being violated by her.

The ludicrous character of this so-called sovereignty is disclosed in an article reprinted in Churchill's Voyage; it shows that the regal dignity was acquired by the "king" of the Mosquitos by the gift of a crown and commission; the crown was an old cocked hat and the commission a waggish document that he should kindly use and release such straggling Englishmen as should choose to come that way with plantain, fish, and so forth.

Upon this foundation Lord Palmerston answered the American protest against the violation of the Monroe doctrine by informing Mr. Lawrence, American minister at London in 1848, that—

a close political connection had existed between the Crown of Great Britain and the State and Territory of Mosquito for a period of two centuries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AINEY. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman whether he has examined the message of the President of the United States with especial reference to the arguments that are now being submitted in the other legislative branch of this Government with a purpose of discovering whether there has not been an entire shift of reasoning for the removal of the exemption of tolls. On that point I desire to call his attention to a statement in the President's address which is as follows, referring to that exemption:

And is, moreover, in plain contravention of the treaty with Great Britain concerning the canal concluded on November 18, 1901.

On May 5, in the other branch of this Congress, I find in the RECORD, on page 8389, the words of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, Senator STONE, who is presumed from his position to be better acquainted with all matters of foreign relations than any other Member of either branch of Congress, in which he says:

I was fully convinced in my own mind that the United States had a right under the very terms of the treaty itself, and without violating either the letter or the spirit of that convention, to allow our coastwise vessels to pass through the canal free of tolls.

Has the gentleman compared those two statements for the purpose of reconciling them?

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman—if that is intended as an inquiry to me—that I have not; I long since discovered that I had not sufficient agility of mind or body to follow the quick changes which overnight occur in the administration's position. Some time ago I read the platform of the Democratic Party with a good deal of interest. It is not now recognizable as such. I have attempted once or twice to reconcile it with the statements of the gentlemen elected on that platform made on the floor of the House, but I grew tired; and so if the gentleman himself has any explanation I hope he will make it in his own time. As far as I am concerned, I would as soon attempt to "untangle the intangible."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to two other statements.

Mr. AINEY. Very well.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention further, apropos to the discussion of this treaty, to the statement of the President:

Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much-debated matter, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal.

With the gentleman's permission I will call his attention to a further statement by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the other body of the National Congress, in which he says:

True it is that in the course of the present debate some Senators and Representatives have declared that the exemption provision of the law of 1912 should be repealed because in their opinion it is in conflict with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and that its enactment did in some sense involve the good faith and honor of this Nation. But that is being said here in Congress and in American and foreign newspapers, and not by foreign Governments. As to that contention, by whomsoever made, I absolutely dissent, for I still believe that the act of 1912

asserted no right to which we are not lawfully entitled within the very terms of the treaty. No foreign Government is now asking us to repeal this law; no foreign Government has filed or presented any protest since its enactment.

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, it rather strikes me that there is no parallel, except in the fact that Great Britain has made no less than eight treaties affecting her Central American claims, and in each instance attempted to interpret them against their plain language.

Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State in 1853, thus characterizes Great Britain's violation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty:

The protectorate which Great Britain has assumed over the Mosquito Indians is a most palpable infringement of her treaties with Spain, and the authority which she is there exercising under pretense of this protectorate is in derogation of the sovereign rights of several of the Central American States, and contrary to the manifest spirit and intention of the treaty of April 19, 1850, with the United States.

Though ostensibly the direct object of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was to guarantee the free and common use of the contemplated ship canal across the Isthmus, there were other and highly important objects sought to be accomplished by the convention. The stipulation regarded most of all by the United States is that for discontinuing the use of her assumed protectorate of the Mosquito Indians. It was the intention, as it is obviously the import of the treaty of April 19, 1850, to place Great Britain under an obligation to cease her interposition in the affairs of Central America and to confine herself to her limited rights in the Belize. She has by this treaty of 1850 obligated herself not to occupy or colonize any part of Central America or to exercise any dominion therein. Notwithstanding these stipulations, she still asserts the right to hold possession of and to exercise control over large districts of that country and important islands in the bay of Honduras, the unquestionable appendages of the Central American States. This jurisdiction is not less mischievous in its effects nor less objectionable to us, because it is covertly exercised, partly at least, in the name of a miserable tribe of Indians, who have in reality no political organizations, no actual government, not even the semblance of one, except that which is created by British authority and upheld by British power.

In his third annual message to Congress, in 1855, President Pierce voiced a resolute and robust protest against Great Britain's persistent violation of the treaty.

President Buchanan in his fourth annual message to Congress announced that "Her Britannic Majesty concluded a treaty with Honduras on the 28th of November, 1859, and with Nicaragua on the 28th day of August, 1860, relinquishing the Mosquito protectorate." Great Britain recognized by that treaty as belonging "to and under the sovereignty of Nicaragua the country hitherto occupied by the Mosquito Indians within the frontiers of the Republic; that a certain designated district should be assigned to these Indians, but that it should remain under the sovereignty of Nicaragua and should not be ceded by the Indians to any foreign Province or State, and that the British protectorate should cease three months after the exchange of ratification." Great Britain executed a treaty with Guatemala defining the boundaries of Belize in 1859.

The expressions of satisfaction by President Buchanan at this solution of the controversy were premature. They were based upon the assumption that Great Britain had ceased to exercise any influence whatever over the Mosquito Coast. These treaties had as little effect upon British pretensions as did the treaties with Spain and with the United States. Nicaragua protested against the violation, and finally, in 1880, agreed with Great Britain to submit the questions at issue, including "the degree of influence Great Britain was entitled to exercise over the Mosquito Coast," to the arbitration of the Emperor of Austria. His decision sustained Nicaragua's claim of sovereignty, but, strange to say, imposed limitation on its exercise whereby British influence remained.

The treaties with Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala were made because of the feeling engendered in the United States at the persistent violation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which had been entered into on the part of the American Government in the hope that it settled forever the pretension of Great Britain to territorial rights in Central America.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty proved a keen disappointment to the American people. It was a source of annoying and ineffective diplomatic correspondence.

In spite of its terms the British Government continued to claim a protectorate over the Mosquito Coast and did not cease to occupy Bay Islands and the Belize.

With the completion of the Suez Canal, which gave England a short route to India, her interest in the opening of the Isthmian Canal waned. It was apparent that Great Britain did not intend to give financial support to the project as contemplated.

A half century had elapsed since the convention was signed, marked by marvelous development on this side of the Atlantic. What was impossible in 1850 was comparatively easy in 1900. The population of the United States increased to 76,000,000; the material resources had advanced accordingly. Public sentiment crystallized around the statement, "An American canal on American soil under American control."

The negotiations which led to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the execution of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in 1901 are interesting. It was clearly shown to Great Britain that the American Government had every reason to consider the older treaty abrogated, both because of violation of its terms and by changed conditions. It stood in the way of the construction of the canal.

After years of negotiations it was "superseded" by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901, but under it the ever-recurrent "right of Great Britain in Central American affairs" out of merest shadow again appears. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois and to Mr. THACHER to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to take such time as the chairman of the committee could spare me to bring to the attention of the House my reasons for introducing the bill which I filed this afternoon, and I had hoped that there would be a large number of the Members present to hear my suggestions, but in the absence of many of the Members I am going to submit my suggestions for the benefit of the few who are present and this great assembly of vacant seats, hoping that those who read the RECORD may understand some of the reasons that prompt me to act in the matter.

During the consideration of a bill before the Committee of the District of Columbia a few days ago, the bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] providing for an increase in the wages of certain employees of the Government of the United States in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. Referring to the gentleman's suggestion of the large number of absentees, I trust he will allow it to go into the RECORD that the minority is furnishing about three times as many Members to listen to what the gentleman has to say as the majority.

Mr. GORMAN. I am glad the gentleman refers to that fact, because—

Mr. BARTLETT. There are only 10 Members on that side of the House.

Mr. GORMAN (continuing). Because the majority are doing the courteous thing to-day in meeting that great army of noble women who are here to present their petition to the Congress of the United States [applause], asking that they may have what I believe every citizen of the United States ought to have, without regard to distinction of sex, the right of suffrage. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GORMAN. And in further answer, I might say to the gentleman I desired to submit some suggestions in reference to my bill, or I, too, would be among that great number who are greeting the women who come here from all parts of the country to present their petition.

Mr. SLOAN. What excuse is the gentleman going to give for keeping us here with his eloquence and preventing us seeing the ladies' parade?

Mr. GORMAN. The gentleman is not being detained by my eloquence from meeting the ladies; probably because ladies do not vote in his State, therefore he is not concerned about them. But, Mr. Chairman, when interrupted I was about to direct the attention of the committee to this fact: There are a great many men employed here in Washington in the service of the Government of the United States and also in the District government, and they have been so employed, many of them at least, about 30 years, at the insignificant salary of \$50 a month, and the bill which I presented is designed to give the men so employed an increase of salary; not certain, particular men, but all men employed by the Federal Government and by the District of Columbia who are classed as skilled or unskilled laborers. I am prompted to introduce this bill because of certain incidents which occurred in the committee room of the District of Columbia. When the bill H. R. 7389 was before the subcommittee of the District Committee a man who represented himself as a lawyer stated he was interested in lobbying for that bill and that he had charged the men whose wages the bill is designed to increase a certain fixed fee, and expected to charge them a contingent fee of 20 per cent of the increase which they would receive if the bill became a law during the first year after the increase was granted. A few months ago a hearing before the Committee of the District of Columbia developed this state of facts: A number of men employed by the

District of Columbia receiving \$55 a month, I believe it was, had their wages increased by an act passed in the Sixty-second Congress, and a man representing himself as a lawyer or lobbyist had charged these men the enormous sum of \$4,000 for alleged services in getting the bill through the House and Senate.

A number of years ago, about 18 years ago, I think it was, I was employed in the Government Printing Office. A number of men in that office at that time were seeking an increase in wages, and rumor had it that these men had raised a fund of \$5,000 to get this increase through Congress, and it was my impression then, based upon my inexperience and lack of knowledge and the rumors then in circulation, that the money had to be paid to some Members of Congress. My recollection of this rumor of 18 years ago was revived when the statement was made before the District Committee by one of the men whose wages had been increased by the action of the Sixty-second Congress, while testifying before the District of Columbia Committee, that representations had been made to the men whose wages were increased that the man who was collecting the money did not keep it all for himself, but that he had to distribute it in entertainment of Members of Congress. It is conduct of this kind, I maintain, on the part of lobbyists—which is only a polite name for grafter—that tends to bring the House of Representatives into disrepute, and this House owes it to itself to take action on matters of that character which will forever stop that kind of misrepresentation on the part of lobbyists. I would have the employees of the Federal and District Governments know that the services of a lobbyist in securing an increase of wages through congressional action is not only unnecessary, but that money paid to lobbyists in that regard is wasted, and I shall oppose and do all I can, while I am a Member of this House, to defeat any legislation providing for an increase in pay to Government employees which is inspired by the activity of paid lobbyists or in which any lobbyist claims a fee contingent upon favorable action of Congress. So far as the employees to whom I have referred are concerned, the Government of the United States ought to pay these men, as a matter of right, better wages than it is paying.

When there is an appropriation bill before this House for battleships or for the erection of public buildings or anything else that the Government has to do with we invariably hear it said that the thing to be built or the thing to be done ought to be built or done in such a way as to be in keeping with the character and dignity of the Republic, and the Government of the United States ought to give to the men who work for it wages that will be in keeping with the character of the work they do, and enable them to live decently and maintain their families in respect, and no man can do this, in my judgment, under present living conditions, on a wage of \$50 a month. I know it is quite fashionable when proposals are made to increase the salaries of Government employees to cry out against it in the interests of economy and in defense of the overburdened taxpayer, but I do not believe there is a taxpayer in the land among all our hundred millions of people who would object to the Government of the United States paying its laborers \$65 a month. I rather think it will be a shock to many good people to know that the United States pays its laborers and some of its mechanics as low a wage as \$50 a month. The fact remains, however, and it was stated under oath before the District of Columbia Committee, that there are engineers, firemen, painters, and other mechanics and laborers employed by the Government of the United States in the District of Columbia at \$50 a month. The Government employees here in the District of Columbia ought to be paid better wages than men are paid in private employment. When they come here to take up a permanent residence they sacrifice the greatest right of citizenship, the right of suffrage.

When we consider the great sacrifice that men and women have made to secure the right of suffrage and the agitation now going on for its extension the sacrifice of that right for the privilege of holding a Government job in Washington can not be regarded lightly. As I view it, such a sacrifice can not be compensated for in money. Of course one living in Washington may retain a legal residence for the purpose of voting in his State, but if he happens to be a civil-service employee his rights are restricted because political activity may be frowned upon as "pernicious" by those higher in authority than the one whose activity is frowned upon. Then, too, there is so much red tape about Government work, such strict adherence to ancient rules, so much bowing down to convention; so much deference paid to "rank" and "tenure" that initiative and ambition are soon stifled in the atmosphere of official life and Government service in Washington. While employed in the Government Printing Office a number of years ago I met many young men in that and other departments of the Government; men of good education,

bright, active, hopeful, full of energy and ambition. They had not been here long then and few of them expected to remain permanently. Some of them have passed away to the great beyond, but many more are here to-day in the same position they held then, working for the same salary and under the same conditions. I am sure that many of them if they had exerted the energy they possessed in the service of some private concern or had gone into business for themselves and worked in their own interests as faithfully and devotedly as they have done for Uncle Sam they would to-day be occupying positions of trust and responsibility in the industrial, commercial, or professional life of their community. There is a beauty and charm about Washington that seems to exercise a subtle influence upon nearly all who come and remain here. They soon become inoculated with a virus that is absolutely fatal to initiative and ambition.

If I were asked by a young man or woman in my community my views as to whether or not they should accept Government employment here in Washington, my advice would be to stay upon the farm and enjoy the real liberty that goes with that life. [Applause.] Or if you must leave the farm, if you must respond to the call of the city, go into industrial or commercial pursuits, where you will know the thrill of ambition. Do not come to Washington. Washington, in my judgment, is the cemetery, the sepulcher, for initiative and ambition. When men say that Government employees here in Washington are overpaid, I say they are not, in view of the sacrifices they make. For myself, I would rather be out in the world of action, where things are being done, taking part in the doing of them, contributing my little share in a humble way, even at a small wage, and be a part of the great world of action, where men grow by contact with their fellows, than be here in the Government service, where men, sooner or later, become inoculated with a virus that destroys their ambition and renders them as absolutely helpless and inefficient after a few years for the great struggle of active life as the hookworm renders inefficient and helpless its victims in the South. Many a young man and woman has come to Washington to get the experience of Government service in the hope that it would help them realize some higher ambition, and in a few years the only hope they entertain is that they may be permitted to retain the position they hold. With them ambition has become stifled. The Government service may have acquired another human machine to carry out its routine, but the country has lost a mind and brain and hand that will never again know the throb of ambition, the restless disposition to try, to do, and to achieve. But this discussion has gone beyond the limits of my bill. The men whom I am interested in helping are the men who now work for small wages for the great big Government of the United States and for the District of Columbia, men who have no organization and who therefore can not act in concert, men who must present their plea for an increase in wages individually, and who, in their helplessness, turn hopefully to the charlatan, who takes their money and assures them he will accomplish that which no one but the Congress of the United States can do; and to make his promise impressive he indulges in the slander that his fee will be spent, in part at least, in winning the favorable consideration of Congress by lavish entertainment. The men who will be benefited by favorable action on my bill are the "underdogs" of the Government service, the men who render a real service for a ridiculously low wage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH], who has, I think, 10 or 12 minutes—

The CHAIRMAN. The debate will close at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. I will yield of Mr. HINEBAUGH's time two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, now, while the women of the country are assembled here on the Capitol steps to present their demand for equal suffrage, I shall read as a part of my remarks the following declaration, proclaimed by the women of this Nation:

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—1914.

"When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one half of the people to dissolve the political bondage which has held them subject to the other half of the people, and to assume the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to freedom.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments should be instituted among both men and women, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people—women people as well as men people—to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect the safety and happiness of all the people. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes, and, accordingly, all experience has shown that womankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to keep them under absolute subjection, although they are spiritually and mentally ready for freedom, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such subjection and to provide new guards for their future security and the security of their children.

"Such has been the patient endurance of the women of this country; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to demand an alteration in the system of government. The history of our Government is a history of repeated injustice to women as wives, mothers, and wage earners, and of repeated usurpation by men, many of them with the avowed object of protecting women. But the direct result has been the establishment of a Government which benefits by the knowledge and experience of only one-half of the people, and which can not fully represent the interests and the needs of the other half of the people.

"In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms, beginning even before the Constitution of the United States was adopted. Our repeated petitions have frequently been answered by ridicule and by repeated injustice. We have appealed to the native fairness and magnanimity of men that they disavow these usurpations which inevitably render less dignified, honest, and harmonious the relations between men and women. Men have too long been deaf to this voice of justice and honor, but many are now joining with us in our refusal to acquiesce longer in this unwarrantable sovereignty over us and over our children.

"We, therefore, the women citizens of the United States of America, assembled to-day throughout the Nation, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the organized womanhood of America demanding enfranchisement, solemnly publish and declare that women ought to be politically free.

"Here and now, in this glorious springtime of the year, under the azure skies of hope, in the sunshine of life and enlightenment, we dedicate ourselves to the great work we have undertaken, and go forward to victory remembering that in unity there is strength, and that not even the prejudices of the ages nor the powers of entrenched political privilege can keep in continual disfranchisement half of the citizens of our country when their rights are demanded by the intelligent, patriotic, and united womanhood of the land.

"Women of America, this is our country; we have the same devotions to its institutions as that half of the citizenship that is permitted to govern it. We love the flag, and it means as much to us as it does to the men of our Nation. Women have made, and women will make, as many sacrifices for the honor and glory of these United States as those of her citizens who have all the rights and privilege of the suffrage. Given our full citizenship and allowed to share in the Government, we will be as jealous of the honor and integrity of our country as we have been in the past, when in countless ways we have shown our devotion to the life of the Nation, to the liberty of its citizens, and to the happiness of all the people."

Mr. Chairman, this declaration of the women of the United States is worthy of inscription in our permanent records, and I am glad that it is to be so inscribed. I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, beyond any power I possess to express it, that this declaration does not even suggest the use of force or violence in this land dedicated to equality and equal opportunity. Tomorrow is Mothers' Day and the flag of this Republic will proudly wave from the dome of our Capitol in testimony of the fact that we owe the greatest debt of all to womanhood.

That quality which demands of the manhood of this country the recognition of motherhood will demand that the women of this country assume that responsibility which citizenship imposes, and will impose upon women the duty and give to them the right to vote as the only effective way for any citizen to register his or her will in the enactment of law and to share in the responsibility of governing our country.

WOMEN VOTERS IN COLORADO.

In extension of my remarks I call to the attention of Congress that the recent proceedings in the State of Colorado afford the most convincing arguments for equal suffrage that have been presented during all this struggle of women for their political rights. The State was born into existence with the awful load of alien land ownership. Its vast coal and mineral areas from old Spanish days were subjected to appropriation in large tracts by a few men. These lands had passed into the hands of heartless speculators who thought only of the dollars that could be dug out of the mines and ground out of the workers and consumers of coal. Foreign laborers were imported who were not in tune with Colorado laws and ideals, and were placed at work in the mines.

The soulless interests that owned the mines so manipulated the politics of the State as to pass much of the political authority into sordid and corrupt hands. The courts were controlled, county officials were owned, by the corporations, and finally the miners went on a strike. Facing hunger and poverty, they put their wives and children into tents and established a tent colony. Officers of the law, by arson, murder, and various forms of lawlessness, caused many of these women and children to be burned, shot, or suffocated to death.

Civil war and anarchy ensued. The situation was desperate. Bloodshed and carnage was the order of the day, and the weakling that was in the governor's chair was entirely unable to cope with the situation.

WOMEN VOTERS TO THE RESCUE.

In this hour of calamity the women voters of Colorado in their power and sovereignty as voters, a far greater power in such an emergency than could be generated by any beautiful sentiment of motherhood or chivalry, held a mass meeting at the Colorado Statehouse, and here is what the Colorado papers have to say about the work of those women. The Denver Post of April 26 says:

Army of women camp all day at statehouse and compel writhing governor to do bidding. Ammons tries evasion, delay, and subterfuge, but is conquered. Determined, they stuck it out until their cause was victorious.

In another edition the Denver Post says:

FIVE HUNDRED WOMEN CORNER AMMONS IN CAPITOL—DEMAND STRIKE END—SQUIRMING GOVERNOR FORCED TO END HIS DILATORY TACTICS—SENDS TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT, ASKING IF FEDERAL TROOPS CAN BE CALLED TO COLORADO, AND WOMEN HOLD FORT WAITING ANSWER.

The spirit of militancy swept the women of Denver this morning. It swept a mighty mass meeting of 500 women and nearly 200 men gathered to protest against the sorry dilly-dallying of Gov. Ammons, which has led to bloodshed and the loss of life in the coal fields of southern Colorado.

"Immediate action and no more delay; no more investigation; no more discussion," was the demand of the people. Nor would they be put off. Gov. Ammons played for time. He tried to evade the imperious summons of the meeting to appear before the people and not only listen to their demands but to take action upon them.

But the women would not be put off. They have been patient. They have waited quietly to no end. This morning they were aroused to fever pitch by the news of renewed fighting in the strike district. Gov. Ammons literally was forced to appear before them to listen to their demands for immediate Federal intervention, for the withdrawal of the State troops from the fields and the governor's own presence there, and finally for the arrest of Maj. Hamrock and Lieut. Linderfelt and the investigation of their conduct.

"We demand that the governor here and now shall send a telegram to President Wilson asking for Federal aid," declared Mrs. Robert W. Steele, who headed the mass meeting. "Then a committee of our own women will at once send off that telegram. Nothing less will satisfy us."

DEMAND THAT GOVERNOR ASK FOR FEDERAL AID.

Again the governor played for time. He insisted that he had received word from Congressman TAYLOR that the President refused to grant aid. He was interrupted by Mrs. Steele.

"I have authority for the statement that the telegram which has been given out is not correct," she declared. "The telegram which really was sent stated that the matter had been seriously considered by the President and his Cabinet, but no action could be taken unless the governor himself asked for aid."

Gov. Ammons protested that he could not "affront the President" by asking for aid unless he was assured that the first telegram was incorrect. He begged the women to adjourn and give him an opportunity to ascertain which was correct.

AMMONS'S PLEA DROWNED WITH HISSES OF WOMEN.

His plea was drowned with shouts and hisses. "No, no!" cried the women. "We're going to stay here until we get what we want."

"How could a demand for Federal aid be an affront to the President if he is so anxious to help us?" asked Mrs. Steele in quiet dignity.

The governor openly squirmed and finally agreed to at once send his message to Washington asking which telegram was correct.

"And we'll wait here until you give us an answer," shouted the women as he hurried off, with a bodyguard of Lieut. Gov. Fitzgarrald and two plain-clothes men from the police department, Peter Carr and P. J. O'Connor.

Long before 10 o'clock, the hour set for the gathering of the women to protest against the dilatory policy of Gov. Ammons, which they declare is directly responsible for the Ludlow massacre as well as the later fighting, women began to assemble in the rotunda of the capitol.

WOMEN FROM THE HILL MINGLE WITH WORKERS.

There were women from capitol hill, women from business offices, wives of laborers and workmen. It was a representative crowd, and from the lips of all the women came determined words.

This once they would assert their power as citizens and voters to the fullest extent. Women and children had lost their lives in the strike district. And it was the sons and brothers and husbands of these women who had been sent down to Ludlow to bring about peace at the risk of their lives.

By 10 o'clock the halls of the capitol were crowded, with the leaders standing in the rotunda of the building. Promptly at the hour, Mrs. Robert W. Steele, chosen at the mass meeting on Thursday to head the demonstration, and Mrs. Alma Lafferty, president of the Woman's Peace Organization, which first called the meeting, stepped to the head of the ranks of women.

"HERE TO DEMAND END OF CIVIL WAR," SAYS LEADER.

"Women of Denver," cried Mrs. Lafferty, "we are gathered here to-day on very serious business. We are not here to take sides in this terrible trouble between the strikers and the operators. But we are here to demand of the governor that he at once take steps to bring this civil war to an end. We are not accusing anyone, but we want action at once, and let us stay here until we get it."

"We're going to stay," shouted the women, cheering and waving their handkerchiefs.

"I ask you to be quiet and dignified in presenting these demands," urged Mrs. Lafferty. "We want to act with credit to all the women of the State. Let us go forward with the quietness of despair."

Headed by Mrs. Steele, the women marched toward the governor's office. At the door they were stopped by Jackson, the governor's messenger.

"The governor asks you to go to the chamber of representatives," they were told. "All of you can't get in here."

FORCE PROMISE THAT THE GOVERNOR WILL APPEAR.

"Will the governor come up there?" asked the women, and not until they were assured that he would come before them would they leave the office, which was literally besieged.

Once gathered in the house of representatives, the women opened their meeting with the singing of "America." There were tears in the eyes of many of them, and the word was passed from lip to lip, "Remember the women and children who died at Ludlow."

"I will appoint a committee of women to wait upon the governor and demand his presence," announced Mrs. Lafferty. "Will Mrs. Herlinger, Mrs. Stuart D. Walling, Mrs. Evangeline Hartz, and Mrs. J. J. Ryan inform him that we are waiting for him?"

As the committee withdrew someone started singing the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," and in a few minutes the chamber was ringing with the martial song.

AMMONS GETS GUARD BEFORE GOING TO MEET.

For half an hour Ammons kept the women waiting while he sent for Chief O'Neill, two plain clothes men, and several traffic policemen to guard him and to preserve order.

"Why are these men allowed to enter the governor's chambers and confer with him when we are waiting?" the women demanded.

"Why, they're officers of the law," spoke up some one, "and, besides, the governor is talking with D. W. Brown on the telephone and considers that more important than conferring with the women."

Finally the committee of women were admitted. The governor was seated at his desk with Fitzgarrald by his side and the two policemen on guard.

"Gov. Ammons," said Mrs. Robinson, "we are here simply to escort you to the chamber above and to ask your immediate presence there. The women wish to present some resolutions to you."

The governor cleared his throat, then asked if the committee could not present the resolutions. "I have important matters to attend to, ladies," he said. "I have just received word that there is fighting going on at three mines down in the strike district. The attorney for the mine workers is waiting to confer with me. There are steps which must be taken immediately to prevent loss of life. I have no time to listen to resolutions."

WOMEN HOLD GOVERNOR TO PROMISE TO APPEAR.

"We, too, represent those who are desirous of preventing loss of life," he was told. "Gov. Ammons, as the State's chief executive you owe it to the women of Colorado to appear before them. We are here to help you, but we were assured before retiring upstairs that you would appear at the meeting."

"Good God, there's firing going on down there," cried Fitzgarrald, waving his hands. "The governor will come to you when the firing ceases."

"I have just until noon to arrange these important matters," pleaded the governor. "Can't you wait until then?"

"We will keep you only five minutes," insisted the women, and with a hopeless wave of the hand the governor finally assented.

He was then escorted to the house of representatives, still accompanied by Fitzgarrald and the detectives, with the women following him. As they entered the house all the women arose and shouted, then sat down quietly at a signal from Mrs. Lafferty.

"Gov. Ammons and women of Denver," she said, "we have come here on a peaceful mission. We are not here to take sides in this matter of the strike, but to demand that this dreadful warfare in southern Colorado cease at once. I am pleased to introduce to you Mrs. Robert W. Steele, who will present our demands to the governor."

MRS. STEELE IS CHEERED AS SHE CONFRONTS HIM.

The women arose and waved their handkerchiefs and cheered as Mrs. Steele came forward.

"In the name of humanity and of the women of the State of Colorado and the city of Denver, I present to you these resolutions, Gov. Ammons, adopted at the meeting of the Women's Peace Association on Monday," she said. "We request that you act upon them at once:

"Resolved, That we demand the immediate intervention of the United States troops in the strike district; that we demand the immediate withdrawal of the State troops from the field and the immediate presence of the governor in that district, in order that he may, as chief executive of the State, bring about peace in that district; and that we demand the arrest of Maj. Hamrock and Lieut. Linderfelt, and that they be brought to Denver so that their conduct may be investigated."

"Gov. Ammons, I am assured that a telegram from Congressman Taylor which was given out and printed in our newspapers all over the State a few days ago was not the correct telegram which was sent by him.

CORRECT TELEGRAM HELD BACK, SAYS MRS. STEELE.

"The first telegram stated that the congressional delegation had called upon President Wilson and the Cabinet and that Federal aid was considered out of the question. The second telegram, which I am assured was the true one, stated that the matter had been taken up by President Wilson and his Cabinet, that they had spent much time in serious consideration of it, but that nothing could be done unless Gov. Ammons requested aid.

"We therefore ask, Gov. Ammons, that you here and now write out a message to Wilson, asking for aid, and that Mrs. Lafferty then appoint a committee of women to see that the telegram immediately is sent off."

WOMEN SHOUT AS BLANK IS HANDED TO GOVERNOR.

The house fairly shook with applause and deafening shouts as Mrs. Steele finished and handed a telegram blank to the governor. Mrs. Lafferty stepped forward, asking if she might appoint a committee, but the governor shook his head and stood up.

"Ladies," he said, "while in Washington I took up the matter of Federal intervention with the President. It wasn't the first time. Early last winter, when affairs here reached a crisis, I made inquiries as to the possibility of intervention in case the State should be unable to handle the situation, and was given very discouraging reports.

"When I left for Washington a week ago Tuesday I went in the fullest confidence that there would be no more trouble in the strike district. By the time I had reached there the Mexican situation was very acute. President Wilson and the Cabinet were engrossed in the consideration of it.

"Then I got word of the trouble here. Not until last Tuesday night did I get anything very definite. At that time I could not see the President, but took up with the members of the investigating committee sent out here from Congress, and also with our own congressional delegation, the matter of intervention.

ATTEMPT TO PUT OFF WOMEN HISSED DOWN.

"When the situation became so acute I left for Denver. On the road I received a telegram stating that the congressional delegation from this State had interviewed the President and that there was no hope of Federal intervention. That is the telegram which was given out. If I was not correct, I want to know it. Before going any further I would like to telegraph to Washington and find out what is correct. It will take only a few hours, and if you will adjourn until to-morrow morning"

The governor was not given an opportunity to complete his sentence, which was drowned out by the shouts of protestation.

"We're going to say right here," cried the women.

The governor looked around helplessly, then spoke again.

"I was assured when I came up here that you were to help me," he said. "God knows I need help. I don't need anything else. I have used what little ability I have to serve this State and to bring about an adjustment in this matter."

WANTS COMMITTEE TO GET FACTS IN CASE, HE SAYS.

"I have had only a few hours to get in touch with the situation. I am trying to organize a committee, headed by the chief justice of the State, to go down South and make investigations and find out what are the facts in the case. When we know the facts, then we can act, and no one will demand a more speedy punishment of the guilty parties if they are found than I will.

"I didn't go to bed last night until 2 o'clock, when I tried to get a little sleep. But I couldn't sleep at all, and got up at 5. Since I went into office I have spent on an average of 16 hours a day at my desk. And I am willing to spend every hour of every day of the coming weeks in the effort to adjust this matter without further bloodshed. Until you give me a good chance, I ask you as good citizens to give me your help and support. Give me an opportunity, an opportunity. I can't do anything unless I have public sentiment back of me."

WOMEN SING AS THEY WAIT ANSWER TO TELEGRAM.

The women, while refusing to adjourn, consented to wait until the governor could send off his telegram. They spent several hours singing songs and listening to the speeches of women who had been down in the strike district.

Here is the report as it appeared in the Rocky Mountain News and Times of April 26:

DETERMINATION OF MOTHERS, WIVES, AND DAUGHTERS BRINGS APPEAL OF GOVERNOR TO STOP KILLING STRIKERS.

(By Mildred Morris.)

A silent army of 1,000 women marched to the house chamber of the capitol yesterday morning. In its ranks were women with babes in arms, white-haired women whose eyes were dimmed by age, working women, women from Capitol Hill, women of all classes and of all ages. The army summoned the governor of the State to come before it. The governor came. It demanded that he send a telegram to Washington. The telegram was sent. It demanded that he appeal to Washington for Federal troops. The appeal was made.

GOVERNOR OBEYS ORDERS.

Never was there anything like it. These women who ordered the State's chief executive to do their bidding and were obeyed accomplished a great thing, and accomplished it in perfect peace and dignity. There were no threats, no hisses, no jeers. It was an assemblage that gave equal suffrage a new meaning.

The women who came believed they had a solemn duty to perform and they did not go away until they had performed it. Never were there women more deadly in earnest, more grimly determined.

WAIT ALL DAY FOR REPLY.

They stayed, most of them, from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the afternoon waiting for an answer to the governor's first telegram to the President. They sent word down to the executive office that those who could would remain at their posts until the gathering's demands were granted; it mattering not whether they were made to wait all night or all week, they would wait and keep sending their committee with their commands.

There was no impatience. While they kept their vigil they sang "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," "John Brown's Body," "Onward, Christian Soldiers," and "Nearer, My God, to Thee."

At 6 o'clock there were still watching women left—150 of them. They were weary, but still grimly determined, women.

"Women, we are making history," said Dora Phelps Buell in ringing tones. "Stay on."

"We will," they cried back.
There was a call for volunteers to keep "the watch fires burning all night" if necessary. All 150 women rose to volunteer.
"We will all stay," they cried. "We will wait until the governor does our bidding."

CHEERS FOLLOW VICTORY.

When their committee came with a message from the governor that he was drafting an appeal for Federal troops they sprang to their feet and made such a demonstration as their tired voices would permit, and then sang "Praise God from Whom All Blessings Flow."
"Our work is not yet done," said Mrs. Alma Lafferty. "Women, we must wait until we see the draft of the appeal and know that it is sent. Will you wait?"

"We will," came back in chorus.
And they did. Not a woman among them left the statehouse until that appeal was sent.

CONSTANT WATCH KEPT.

In the governor's office waited the committee delegated by the women to carry its commands to the chief executive—its members, Mrs. Robert W. Steele, widow of the late chief justice of the supreme court; Mrs. Alma Lafferty, president of the Women's Peace Association; State Senator Helen Kling Robinson, Mrs. Stuart Walling, and Mrs. John Joseph Ryan. It did not relax its vigil for a moment, not even to eat. It lunched on sandwiches and dined in the governor's anteoffice on oranges and bananas. When the governor returned from his own dinner he found the committee still on the job, tired eyed but cheerful. All day it had followed him like a Nemesis.

Some of the women who waited upstairs went all day without food, not a few of whom were gray-haired women. They would not leave their posts until the draft of the governor's appeal for Federal intervention had been read to them.

NEW DEMANDS ARE PLANNED.

And when they at last dispersed after a 12 hours' vigil, tired to death but triumphant, the 150 watchers made it known that if the President refused Federal aid to end the carnage in the southern coal fields the army of 1,000 women would return and make new demands.

They wanted a cessation of bloodshed in the strike zone, and they would have it. As the mothers of the State, they had awakened to their power and were serving notice on those elected to serve the Commonwealth of Colorado and to remember that there were determined women who, like sentinels, henceforth would be on guard to protect human rights and to prevent the murder of men, women, and children in industrial warfare.

COMMITTEE IMPRESSES GOVERNOR.

The assembly of women apparently was not taken seriously by Gov. Ammons until a committee waited on him to summon him before it.

"We have come, Mr. Governor, to escort you to the house chamber where the women of Denver await you," said Senator Helen Kling Robinson.

"I am very busy, ladies," answered the governor, nervously. "You can tell me what the meeting wants and I will give my answer through you."

"But the women want to hear from you directly, Mr. Governor," said Mrs. Robinson in a quiet tone.

"It is impossible for the governor to leave this office at this time," put in Lieut. Gov. Fitzgarrald. "He can't see these women now."

"BUSY," SAYS GOVERNOR.

"I am kept busy talking over the long-distance phone," said Gov. Ammons. "I am trying to keep peace at one of the mines where there is firing. I can not come."

"Gov. Ammons," said Mrs. Robinson firmly, "the women of Denver summon you. The women of Denver, do you understand?"

"You ought to understand the governor can't come now," put in the lieutenant governor again.

Mrs. Evangeline Heartz, another member of the committee, rose to her feet and pointed her finger at Fitzgarrald.

"Lieut. Gov. Fitzgarrald, the women of Denver are gathered upstairs," she said. "They want to see Gov. Ammons and they will see him. Do you hear?"

WORKING FOR PEACE, HE SAID.

"I am trying to bring about peace and I can only listen to those who want to help me," said the governor.

"The women upstairs are also desirous of bringing about peace," said Mrs. Robinson, "and they have come to help you, Gov. Ammons."

"But don't you see, ladies, I can not leave right now?" pleaded the governor. "I must keep peace at this mine."

WILL WAIT, HE IS TOLD.

"We don't insist that you come right now, if you can not," said Mrs. Robinson; "the women will wait for you. They are patient."

"Better come back this afternoon or some other time," suggested the lieutenant governor.

"Oh, no, Lieutenant Governor," said Mrs. Robinson with a quiet smile. "We will wait until the governor is ready for us to escort him upstairs."

"Just a minute, then," said Gov. Ammons.

AGREES TO MEET THEM.

He went into the inner room and came out directly.
"I am ready to go now," he told the committee, and Lieut. Gov. Fitzgarrald and Detective Peter Carr and T. W. Connor, in plain clothes, walking beside him, the governor followed the committee upstairs.

The second time the committee waited on the governor Mrs. Steele bade him not to forget that the women demanded that he order Maj. Hamrock and Lieut. Linderfelt arrested and brought here to be tried on a charge of murder.

PROMISES INVESTIGATION.

"This shooting at Ludlow is to be investigated and the guilty ones punished," answered the governor. "But how can we try Hamrock and Linderfelt here, even if they were guilty? They'd have to be tried down there. We couldn't possibly try them here."

"Under the Moyer decision you can do anything, Mr. Governor," suggested Mrs. Robinson.

The governor made no answer.

Before 10 o'clock, the hour set for assembling, the women who responded to the Women's Peace Association's call thronged the corridor of the capitol.

"Women, let us proceed in a dignified manner to the governor's office," said Mrs. Alma Lafferty, president of the Women's Peace Association.

MRS. STEELE HEADS LINE.

A line was formed with Mrs. Robert W. Steele at its head. The vanguard was met at the door of the executive offices by Jackson, the governor's negro messenger.

Later, Mrs. Steele, Mrs. Robinson, Mrs. Ryan, and Mrs. Walling composed a committee appointed to remain with Gov. Ammons until he had dictated a telegram to President Wilson.

Mrs. P. T. Hurlinger, wife of a carpenter, was the first member of the committee named. She had her 8-months-old baby with her and carried the little one to the governor's office. Mrs. Robinson, Mrs. Heartz, and Mrs. John Joseph Ryan completed the committee.

About the same time the committee reached the governor's office. Detectives Carr and Connor had arrived there, summoned by Chief of Police O'Neill, who was in conference with the governor.

Mrs. Robinson insisted that the Taylor telegram to the governor be verified. On the governor's private telephone she called the Western Union office and had the telegram read to her over the telephone.

Exactly what had the women voters of Colorado done? They had broken all known precedents by compelling a governor of an American State to apply for Federal troops, admitting his own inability to preserve peace and keep order in the State. Never before had such a thing happened. A mass meeting of men could not have accomplished it. Men would have fought each other. Men would have palavered about "State rights" and "Colorado's dignity." But these women wanted the strike to stop; wanted arson, murder, and pillage to cease.

"THEIR'S NOT TO REASON WHY."

Colorado, Mr. Chairman, as already stated, presents the two biggest of all arguments for woman suffrage. First, the women and children, the homes, suffer first from bad law enforcement, from weak officers, from grasping, grafting capitalists, from men who are careless and irresponsible. They should have the right to vote from simple justice, that they may have an equal opportunity to protect their homes, their children, their dearest rights. Second, the women are competent and efficient in the greatest emergency, in the face of appalling calamity. Instinct tells them how to do the thing, and they do it.

THE WOMEN WILL VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

Will the women vote in this country? Yes. Will the State-rights bogey keep them from acquiring and exercising their own human rights? No.

The Democratic Party organization in this Congress may cause delay, but that party will be driven out of power if it continues in the way. That was a time when men declared that women were without souls, and there were antis in that day who opposed the good women who took issue with the clergy; but despite the antis and the reactionaries, the right of women to enter the pearly gates the equal of man was finally admitted, although the masculine gender is supposed to guard all the portals. Women then struggled for the alphabet and the right of rudimentary education, and the reactionary men of that day and the antis denounced the women, who were called "agitators" and "knockers," "dissatisfied with home environment." They burned at the stake and hung on the gibbets in England and other European countries in 10 generations 3,000,000 women who were attempting to advance the cause of womanhood. They called them witches. The women antis used red in those days to scoff at the women who were persecuted for being intelligent or ambitious. The red was a symbol of the fire which would burn the "witches" to death.

Within my own recollection women have struggled for the right to higher education and to work in gainful pursuits to make their own living. The antis were present in all these struggles, like they paraded the streets—a few of them—to-day with their red roses of scorn. But they are like mosquitoes to the American Army at Vera Cruz—some annoyance. It is true, but, after all, they only serve to stir the boys and the country with a desire to hear the word "On to Mexico."

So it will be in this struggle for equal suffrage. The battle is already won in 10 States and in Alaska. Four more will come in line next November. The Eastern States are beginning to line up. The women of America are going to vote soon. No party question will prevent them; no color line will stop them; no State rights issue will deter them; no State has any right to deny to half its citizens the right to share in government by the exercise of suffrage anywhere under the American flag. As citizens of the great American Republic, as members of the American family, and as units of the great American home, we will not permit such a travesty on democracy to exist any longer in this land of equal opportunity.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I in my own right?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman has about five minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIS. I thought I had more than that. I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen can see for themselves the time. The gentleman from Minnesota is ahead now of the gentleman from Georgia about seven minutes, and debate, under the instruction of the House, is to close at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] will proceed.

Mr. RUCKER. I understood the Chair to say that debate would close at 4.35 p. m.?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUCKER. I serve notice that it will have to stop at that time or have more Members here to listen to the debate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I can not allow this opportunity to pass without voicing what I believe to be the almost unanimous sentiment of the people of my State of West Virginia in favor of a generous pension policy on the part of our Government toward our old soldiers. It will give me great pleasure to vote for the pending bill, which provides for the appropriation for pensions for the ensuing fiscal year. The only pang of regret I feel is that there are very many who should be the beneficiaries of their country's gratitude who have not yet been able to have their claims adjudicated, and yet who are as justly entitled to pensions as any who are at present on the rolls.

I desire to congratulate such of my Democratic colleagues of the Sixty-third Congress as have decided, as well as such Democrats of the Sixty-second Congress as did decide, that the American people will not stand for any parsimonious, cheese-paring attitude toward the veterans of the Civil War and their dependent heirs. It would be a fitting and magnanimous thing if every Democratic Member of Congress—those of the far South as well as those of the North—in these later days, when the harsh feelings engendered by the fearful realities of civil strife have been tempered by the lapse of many years, would join with us and make the vote upon this bill and upon all similarly well-considered bills absolutely unanimous. I am sorry that the number of Democrats who favor a liberal pension policy is so small. Yet I rejoice that in the last Congress a sufficient number of them joined with the Republicans to pass the Sherwood law. Without the aid of Republicans it would have failed of passage, yet I give full credit to those Democrats who assisted in the passage of that beneficent piece of legislation.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party, reunited, is the natural guardian and conservator of the rights and privileges of the old soldier, and to that party he must always look for steadfast devotion to his interests. There are still those on the Democratic side of this House, and elsewhere, who apparently begrudge every dollar that is taken from the National Treasury to pay this honorable debt to those who offered their lives on the altar of their country in the days following the firing upon Fort Sumter. We hear their railings upon every occasion in this body when a pension bill is before us for consideration.

There is a great difference, Mr. Chairman, between a liberal policy in the making, construction, and administration of our pension laws, such as that adopted by the real friends of the soldier, and a policy of scant acquiescence that has been wrung from their quasi friends by the dictates of political expediency. This difference is plainly apparent to those who have prosecuted pension claims under Republican and under Democratic administrations. We all know that a hint from the Executive, that is so effective in all other respects with his party associates, could tighten or loosen the methods employed by those who administer our pension laws, making it practically impossible, on the one hand, or easily possible, on the other, to get claims adjudicated.

I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to all raids upon the Treasury. I do not want, nor does any honest man want, anyone granted a pension who is not equitably or legally entitled to it, but in cases of reasonable doubt at this late day, when the Angel of Death is summoning 100 or more of these battle-scarred veterans every 24 hours, and when it is becoming more and more difficult to obtain the evidence required under the stringent and technical rules adopted by an unfriendly majority, I would, Mr. Chairman, resolve those doubts in favor of the old soldier. I would rather a few should get pensions who might not deserve them than by any mischance a single deserving one shall be deprived of this recognition by his Government in his declining years. Let us be liberal, not technical, in our dealing with this subject. The few paltry dollars we can pay the veterans, even under a liberal policy, will not be a tithe of what these heroes deserve at our hands. Let us make the evening of their lives as com-

fortable as we can, for the day is rapidly approaching when the last one shall have answered the final roll call. A great country such as ours must not be charged with ingratitude.

Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, I want in this connection to make a plea for justice toward a body of men who served their country as willingly and as faithfully as any on the roll of honor of this Republic. I refer to the home guards, the independent State scouts, and those brave auxiliaries of the Army—the teamsters, bridge builders, and railroad repairers of the State of West Virginia. All or most of these men were exposed to great danger in defense of their State and country, storm ridden as it was. They made the same offering of their young manhood that was made by those who served in the volunteer armies, and I want to urge upon you, individually and collectively, that you assist in the enactment into law of the bills I have introduced in this Congress for the relief of these worthy soldiers and helpers—H. R. 9419, H. R. 10157, and H. R. 12118—by placing them upon the muster roll of the soldiers of the late war and by granting them service pensions of \$30 per month. These men are now aged, but their arms are outstretched toward their Government, of which you and I form a part, and all that they ask is simple justice. I expect to continue bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress as long as I am a Member of this body, or until these bills or similar ones that accomplish the same object are passed.

Another point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, is this: A great many old soldiers, who have passed the age of 65 and are thus ineligible to take the civil-service examination, are about to be removed from the positions they now hold as fourth-class postmasters. The ruthless hand of the spoilsman is reaching out and depriving these battle-scarred soldiers of the livelihood they have been earning under Republican administrations. I hereby offer my protest against this intolerable injustice. Is faithful service on the battle field to go for naught? Are wounds to go for naught? Are the technicalities of a civil-service examination a better test of fitness for these offices than years of faithful and wholly satisfactory work? Will the rapacity of Democratic office seekers not stop short of this desecration? Will the mere fact that these old soldiers are Republicans or Progressives outweigh all other considerations?

If I had a thousand tongues I should employ them all in a protest against this inhumanity. In this connection I desire to read one of several typical letters I have received from old soldiers who are in fear of having their very bread and butter taken away from them.

PETROLEUM, W. VA., March 28, 1914.

The Hon. HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SUTHERLAND: Yours of the 27th instant just received—relative to the post office here—and I can not understand why I should unjustly be cut out of the office, having been injured in the United States Army in line of duty during the Civil War, and to such an extent as to be refused reenlistment, as the records of the Pension Office will show; and, then, I can not understand why they desire to change from one tried and proving his efficiency, to one untried and without any business training.

I hope they may yet recognize my right as a wounded soldier of the Civil War.

I herewith return the letter of the Hon. First Assistant Postmaster General.

Please excuse me for intruding so much. Thanking you for your kindness, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

GEO. B. DOUGLASS.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, as much has been said upon this floor for and against the old soldier, I do not care to enter into any discussion as to the merits or demerits of any of our veterans. My record in that regard is well known, I think, to all the people of Minnesota and my section, and I think my votes upon the floor of Congress in the last 10 or 12 years have shown conclusively that I am a friend of the old soldier.

We are now about to pass, and I believe unanimously, a bill appropriating \$169,150,000 for pensions for our old soldiers, their widows, and their orphans. I, for one, do not believe that that bill is one dollar too large. I agree with the present Commissioner of Pensions, who said that that amount would be necessary in order to properly pay them under the existing laws of the United States.

I wish to pay a compliment in this connection to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BARTLETT, of Georgia, who thoroughly investigated the amounts that are required by the Commissioner of Pensions, and the committee, and I will say, the chairman of the committee, was heartily in favor of passing this appropriation bill. There was not a dissenting voice in that committee, and I for one believe that the Commissioner of Pensions has carefully investigated it in all respects, and these are the amounts that he suggested.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word concerning a certain branch of our service, and but a word. We have the two

large branches of the service, the Army and the Navy, and they are large in comparison to another branch of the service called the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps has received, perhaps, its just deserts, and perhaps not, at the hands of the American Congress. They are small in numbers, but are efficient fighting men in all ways. The beginning of this Marine Corps, as I gather from the records, is as follows: The earliest authentic record of marines in America bears the date of 1740, when three companies were organized in New York under the flag of Great Britain. The parent of the present organization, the first and second battalions of American Marines, was created November 10, 1775, by the Continental Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as saying that ever since the organization of this, the oldest corps of the service, the Marine Corps, there never has been an instance on this continent or wherever else the American soldier was sent, where the Marine Corps was not the first in action and bore the brunt of the battle in all cases. Such is the case now at present in Mexico. Such it was in China, and such it always has been.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to use two or three minutes of the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH].

The CHAIRMAN. He has no time.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I shall appropriate two or three minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman two minutes of my time.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, if that is all the time I have, Mr. Chairman, I do not care to say anything more about any branch of the service except to say that there is no more efficient service in our Army or Navy than the marines. They are of the highest quality in all respects. You will notice they were the first that landed at Vera Cruz, and they are the first at every place where trouble exists, and they are the first ones to meet the bullets of the enemy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to extend my remarks by printing in the Record an article written by Frederic J. Haskin on the subject of the Marine Corps of the United States. I do this because it is put in better and more appropriate language than it is possible for me to do under any circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by the insertion of the article mentioned. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS.

(By Frederic J. Haskin.)

"The marines have landed and have the situation well in hand." This has been the burden of countless press dispatches from all quarters of the world.

Repetition of this message from scenes of anarchy and disaster has brought the average citizen to regard the United States marine as a mighty efficient fellow. In fact, he has formed the habit upon reading the first part of the sentence, "the marines have landed," to add the last part as a matter of course.

Wherever this country has had need of faithful service and resolute hearts there the marines have been on hand. Not only in the van at this their second occupation of Vera Cruz, the American marines have been foremost for more than 100 years whenever violence has threatened the Nation's interests. They are the skirmish line of Uncle Sam's authority; the first on the spot, the first to land, and the first to engage in actual fighting.

Further than the fact that they generally carry out their tasks beyond all grounds for argument, there is little definite in the popular idea of the marines. The nature of their service, their organization and administration are not matters of general information. To many the marine is a sailor with belted trousers and a peculiar thirst for trouble.

Marines are soldiers trained for service both on land and on ships of war. They are organized, clothed, and equipped much the same as the soldiers of the Regular Army. They are prepared to fight either as infantrymen or as artillerymen. Their corps forms an independent military organization, which is placed directly under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy. In time of war their principal duty is that of cooperation with the Navy.

Absolute mobility is the ideal of their service. The khaki-clad marine is ready upon an instant's notice to start for a rebellion in China or followers of Huerta in Mexico City. There is never any confusion about a mobilization of marines. They are being mobilized continuously, one place or another, to sit on the lid where trouble is brewing. This is one of their specialties.

READY FOR SERVICE ON SHORT NOTICE.

When the occasion arises it is just a matter of an order and a few hours until the needed marines are on their way. They are old hands at campaigning, camp making and camp breaking, skirmishes, battles, and emergency calls to the world's end. Not a year passes but they are called upon this expeditionary work. They are familiar with life in the Tropics and the rigors of northern encampments.

The headquarters of the corps is in Washington, whence the major general commandant and his staff direct the work of the organization. The marines themselves are scattered over the world in cruising battleships, in foreign stations, at various stations throughout this country, at navy yards, prisons, magazines, and with receiving ships. There are at present about 9,872 enlisted men in the corps and 342 officers.

In the past one of the chief duties of the Marine Corps has been expeditionary work, or response to emergency calls for the protection of the interests of the United States or the lives of its citizens in the

troubled areas of the world. In the performance of this duty they have landed many times in the countries of South and Central America and of the Orient during periods of turmoil. Since 1900, 38 expeditions of American marines have been sent out, the objective points of which stretch from Mexico to Abyssinia and China.

Other duties of the corps have been to provide detachments of from a dozen men under a sergeant to 60 or more under one or two commissioned officers for service afloat in capital ships; guard duty at naval stations, prisons, magazines, and yards; service with receiving ships and in our foreign possessions, and guard duty at such centers of temporary insecurity as Peking and Managua. A detachment of 320 officers and men of the corps protects the legation in Peking at the present time.

The duty of the corps which has now come to be regarded as the most important is that of advanced base work. This means the seizure and maintenance of ports for an advanced base of fleet operations in times of war. Such was the nature of the recent work of the marines at Vera Cruz, and such their occupation of Guantanamo, Cuba, in 1898. In the latter action a small detachment of them held McCalla Hill for three days without food or adequate water against 6,000 Spanish soldiers.

ONE REGIMENT ON EACH COAST.

Two regiments of about 1,250 men are to be organized and trained for this special purpose. One of these regiments is to be stationed on the Atlantic coast, probably at Philadelphia, while a similar regiment will be stationed on the Pacific coast at Mare Island. At the advance base school in Philadelphia the men are being trained as electricians, gunners, and machinists.

Especially care is taken in the selection of recruits and officers for the Marine Corps. Applicants have to undergo strict examinations as to their physical, mental, and moral fitness. The officers are appointed from the Naval Academy, from the ranks, and from civil life. After enlistment the men are given a painstaking training in the work of the corps at recruit camps in Norfolk, Va., and Mare Island.

Marines are excellent shots. This probably explains in large part the effectiveness of their expeditions. Nearly 4,000 members of the corps are ranked as expert marksmen, and their rifle teams make dangerous competitors. Their team won two firsts at the Seagirt meet last year, while a member of the corps won the Seagirt championship match. A team chosen from among the marines on duty at the United States Legation at Peking took first and third places last year, and again last April, in competition with teams from the legation guards of Italy, Austria, Russia, Germany, Great Britain, France, and Holland. Moreover, the marines took first, third, fourth, fifth, seventh, and eighth places in the open championship for north China, May, 1913. This match was won for the third successive year by the marines.

The marine, or the battleship's soldier, was first employed among modern nations by Great Britain for the purpose of quelling insurrections among the ruffian sailors whom she pressed into her service. The employment of infantry on ships of war, however, was probably almost coincident with the fighting ship. In this country the Marine Corps claims to have longer traditions than the Navy. The earliest authentic record of marines in America bears the date of 1740, when three companies were organized in New York under the flag of Great Britain. The parent of the present organization, the "First and Second Battalions of American marines," was created November 10, 1775, by the Continental Congress.

HAVE HAD PART IN ALL UNITED STATES WARS.

The marines took conspicuous parts in the brilliant acts of John Paul Jones. The first battle won by marines was in February, 1777, when 300 of them, under the command of Maj. Samuel Nicholas, carried by storm the English forts on the island of New Providence, in the Bahamas. It was the marines who, during the War with Tripoli, formed the bodyguard of Gen. Eaton, American consul at Tunis, on his remarkable march from Alexandria to Derne, 600 miles across the desert. Upon their arrival at Derne the marines stormed the native fortifications, and for the first time in our history raised the Stars and Stripes on a fortress of the Old World. "Tripoli" has since been inscribed upon their banner. The marines fought by land and sea through the War of 1812. Between 1815 and 1836 they fought the Spanish pirates in the West Indies, and in Sumatra were called upon to quell internal riots and to police New York following the great fire of 1835. In 1836, when the Florida war broke out, they joined in the campaigns against the Creeks and Seminole Indians.

From 1846 to 1848 the marines were engaged in the first war with Mexico. They saw service on both east and west coasts, and accompanied Gen. Scott on his march to Mexico City. They took part in the capture of Monterey, San Francisco, Mazatlan, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose, San Gabriel, and Guaymas.

On the east coast they took part in the capture of Matamoros, Tampico, Frontera, Tabasco, and Vera Cruz. They were also the first division to enter the Grand Plaza, City of Mexico. This explains the inscription on their banners, "From Tripoli to the halls of the Montezumas." A brigade of marines, 5,500 strong, is now waiting at Vera Cruz. Will they be called upon to march through Mexico again?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized until 4.35 o'clock.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is probably the largest appropriation bill we will be called upon to pass at this session, certainly in time of peace. It carries \$169,000,000 for pensions granted by the general law and other laws to the soldiers in the various wars, their widows and their children.

I stated yesterday, Mr. Chairman, that as to the real soldiers—the ones who endured the trials of the march and the camp and the danger and exposure of battle—I have had no objection to giving them a liberal pension, and I have not now. It is only those, Mr. Chairman, who were simply enlisted for 30 or 90 days, who saw no active service, who did not perform any deeds of valor or heroism or service to the country, that I object to granting pensions to and that I have voted against granting pensions to.

This bill, I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, will be passed without serious objection. Every provision in it is to comply with the

existing law and to furnish the money to pay the pensions that the law provides for.

I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill by paragraphs for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, namely:

For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, \$169,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 3, by inserting after the figures "\$169,000,000" the following: "No part of which shall be paid to any pensioner who has an income equal to \$100 per month at the time when the payment of his pension is due, or who has for five years next before the approval of this act continuously resided in a foreign country, unless such pensioner is a native of such foreign country."

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

[Mr. RUCKER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, is the point of order up before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] reserves the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to say, in discussing the point of order at the present time—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule if the gentleman desires.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to be heard on the proposition.

Mr. BARTLETT. The point of order, I understand, has been reserved. The precise question embraced in a portion of this amendment has been ruled upon in the Sixty-second Congress by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Judge BOOHER, of Missouri. Two years ago, when the pension appropriation bill was under consideration, it contained a provision that no part of the appropriation should be paid to those residing in a foreign country who were not citizens of the United States. The point of order was made, and it was overruled. I refer the Chair to that precedent. So far as the amendment relates to payment to foreign residents outside of the United States, the amendment is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What part of the amendment does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. BARTLETT. I say that two years ago, in the Sixty-second Congress, there was reported from the Committee on Appropriations, in the pension appropriation bill, a provision which said that no part of the money provided for in that bill should be paid to any person residing in a foreign country who was not a citizen of the United States, and the point of order was made to the provision that it was legislation. After argument was had the Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BOOHER, decided that it was in the interest of economy and reduced the amount carried in the bill, and therefore it was in order under the Holman rule, and also was a limitation upon the expenditure of the money. I give the Chair the benefit of the ruling, which I can produce with some little research. So I think the amendment is not subject to a point of order; and as to the merits of the amendment, I will discuss that later.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the point of order having been reserved, I want to say a word about the amendment itself. This amendment is a combination of two amendments that were made to the last appropriation bill in the third session of the Sixty-second Congress. The second part of the amendment in particular is a very important feature to pensioners of this country. In 1893 Congress passed a law forbidding the payment of pensions to persons not citizens of the United States. At that time the report on the bill showed that there were 3,000 persons drawing pensions who were not citizens of the United States, and the amount they drew was \$350,000. That was in 1893. In 1912, when this amendment was reported for a second time by the Appropriations Committee, the number of foreign pensioners had grown to 5,405, and the amount of the pensions they drew had grown to \$967,000.

Now, one argument that was made in favor of paying pensions to foreign pensioners was that there were a few widows in Ireland whose husbands had died on the field of battle in the Civil War. I submit to this House that that does not account for the increase of foreign pensioners from 1893 to 1912 from 3,000 to 5,000, and an increase of money from \$350,000 to over \$900,000.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. No; the gentleman has made one slump speech.

Mr. WILLIS. That is hardly a fair statement.

Mr. BORLAND. We are making payments to men who have renounced their American citizenship and are no longer citizens of this country. That is the only explanation that can be made in the increase of pensioners since 1893 upon foreign soil. This sentiment is favored by those who stand with the gentleman from Ohio and make political capital out of the payment of Federal money to pensioners. [Applause.] The Pension Department stated that in the case of these foreign pensioners there was absolutely no way to tell when the pensioner died; there was no way to tell whether the right person got the money; no way to convict a man of fraud if he got money that did not belong to him; there was no way for the Government to safeguard the payment of these pensions. Now, we have \$967,000 paid out every year of the taxpayers' money. You have no way to safeguard that; you must trust to luck that some of it will get into the hands of those to whom it belongs. No American law can reach the payment of that money, and at least two-thirds of it goes into the hands of people who, since 1893, have become nonresidents and in many cases noncitizens of the United States.

This amendment ought to be adopted in fairness and justice to the taxpayers of the United States, in fairness to the old soldiers who stand by the old flag, and if any man is entitled to fair treatment it is the soldier who stands by the colors that pays him the pension.

There is no reason, no justice, in paying nearly a million dollars of the people's money every year into the hands of foreigners. I undertake to say that of the pensionable widows living in Ireland in 1893, not 50 per cent are living to-day. If they are, this law safeguards those people. The gentleman from Missouri has made his amendment so that if the pensioner is a native of a foreign country he continues to draw his pension, and therefore these widows whose husbands fell on the field of battle will not be cut off by the amendment, but it will reach only the class that it ought to reach, and the payment to whom is indefensible, the ones that have renounced their American citizenship and are no longer supporters of the American flag. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment again reported as it now reads?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported as modified.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Has the point of order been made?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the point of order has been reserved by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. GOOD. After the point of order is disposed of I desire to address myself to the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair any doubt about the amendment being in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that one phrase in the amendment is subject to the point of order and the other is not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, is it not merely a limitation upon an appropriation; and, in the next place, is it not clearly in order under the Holman rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks one of the paragraphs in the amendment is. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the whole proposition is in order under the Holman rule. Is the point of order made that it changes existing law?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. One part of it at least is subject to the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman in what respect?

Mr. DAVIS. I think the fore part, in regard to the income of \$100, is subject to a point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as to that, the Chair, in using his common sense, would know that that would tend to reduce expenditures, under the Holman rule.

Mr. DAVIS. I believe that it has been decided that it must appear upon the face of the amendment itself that it does reduce expenditures, and in this case it certainly does not.

Mr. RUCKER. It does so appear upon its face.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have not the Holman rule before me just now, and it is difficult, even as often as I have been over it, to hold the exact provisions of it in mind, but it does seem to me that it is clearly inferable from the face of this amendment that it would reduce expenditures, and, therefore, that that part of it also is in order under the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that the intent of the Holman rule is to apply in the necessary administration of government, and that it would apply in a case of this character where it would tend to reduce the expenditures of the Government. It would therefore apply to the portion relating to those who have an income of \$100; but the Chair does not think it would apply to those who happen not to live in this country; that that is clearly new legislation, not affecting the subject matter relating to the necessary administration of government.

The Chair thinks if individual pensions could be cut off that a logical conclusion must follow that an amendment cutting out all pensions would be by such construction in order.

The Chair realizes, and doubtless the committee does, that every rule must have wholesome exception, and it occurs to the Chair that is such exception to the Holman rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, what about the matter of limitation? It is a limitation on this particular appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Holman rule cover that question?

Mr. RUCKER. If we cut out the pensions of those who live in foreign countries it certainly reduces the amount.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard upon the point of order to make a suggestion to the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will indulge the gentleman.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the rule, an amendment offered to an appropriation bill which manifestly and upon its face would change existing law is not in order. The law of May 11, 1912, provides a pension for all honorably discharged soldiers of the United States Army who served in the Civil War for 90 days or more who have attained a certain age. No exceptions are made in that law. It is on the statute books. This amendment makes a radical change in the law. While it might reduce expenditures, and manifestly upon its face in both these particulars it would reduce expenditures, yet it changes an existing public law in two particulars. In the first place, the law is changed as to all pensioners who are in receipt of \$100 a month from any source whatsoever. The law is changed with respect to all pensioners who happen to be absent from the United States for a period of five years. I therefore think that it is manifestly in violation of the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the Chair was going to state that he thinks one of these phrases in the amendment is out of order, and that would necessarily compel him to rule the entire amendment out, but he would prefer in this instance to follow the precedents heretofore followed by the House, and therefore will overrule the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the adoption of an amendment such as this would be a disgrace to the country. The men who fought the battles for the preservation of the Union are entitled to better consideration than this amendment would give if it were adopted. The granting of a pension to any man who served the country in the time of its direst need is doing no favor whatever to the man who draws the pension. It is a duty and obligation the Government owes to the man who made it possible for us to live here [applause] in a Nation covered by a single flag. It matters not what the income of the man who served in the war may be. That ought not to determine the question whether he is entitled to a pension. The record of his services is the thing upon which the pension is granted, and not upon the question of whether he is able to earn \$100 a month over and above what he may draw from the Public Treasury as a pensioner. The pension is simply a badge of honor for the services he rendered to his Government when it needed men. Who inquired how much income a man had when he volunteered for the war? The question then was, not what is his earning power, but is he fit to be a soldier.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I refuse to yield; I only have five minutes. Men do not seek pensions because in many cases they need the

money. They seek pensions because they wish to have that certificate of honor of service rendered to their country. There is no greater service that a man can render to his nation than that of offering his life in days of need, in days of danger. We have heard patriotic speeches on the floor of this House during the past five or six days because 17 or 18 of our boys were killed at Vera Cruz, and it was very proper they should be made; they encourage those who are facing the enemy. But why discriminate against the man because he happens to be successful, because he happens to be alive after the result of his services to his country? Why discriminate against a man because he happens to have other income? Are you opposed to thrift? The question embodied in this amendment is to penalize a man's success, to say that it is not respectable to be successful—that only paupers need apply. The only question for consideration before this House should be, Ought the man who served the country when it needed his services, who has an honorable discharge, who gave all he had in the defense of his Nation and the honor of its flag, to receive a pension? If he rendered the service and the record justifies it, the pension ought to be granted without condition; but any condition sought to be imposed on any man who has an honorable discharge as a result of his services to his Nation in time of war is an insult to the patriotism of the American people. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I protest against the adoption of any such amendment to this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not prevail. It is unjust, it is manifestly absurd, it is ingeniously cruel to cut off the pension of an American citizen whose business has taken him away from his native country for five years.

Mr. RUCKER. It does not.

Mr. TAGGART. It does it, and I am right about it. The message we would send perhaps to a hero of Gettysburg who might be in the City of Mexico protecting his family and who might have been there for the past five years is this: "That inasmuch as you are not a native of Mexico and because you have lived there for the past five years your pension is cut off." If he were a Mexican, we would not cut his pension off. The Mexican who goes back to Mexico can draw his pension, but the American citizen, perhaps, whom he is trying to murder, has his pension cut off under this amendment.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGGART. I will read the language of the amendment so there will be no "ifs" and "ands."

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman ought to do so to avoid some of the mistakes he has made.

Mr. TAGGART (reading):

No part of which shall be paid to any pensioner who has an income equal to \$100 per month at the time when the payment of his pension is due, or who has for five years next before the approval of this act continuously resided in a foreign country.

And listen.

Unless such pensioner is a native of such foreign country or has become a citizen of a foreign country.

If he is a native of a foreign country or a citizen of a foreign country you pay him a pension. If he still retains his loyalty to the old flag, and did not renounce his citizenship, but has resided five years in a foreign land, you cut off his pension by this amendment. It is manifestly absurd and unjust. The refusal to pay a pension to a man who is in receipt of \$100 a month means simply this, that we consider a pension a gratuity, a crumb from the rich man's table, handed down to some poor Lazarus who has come to receive it. That is not the meaning of a pension to a volunteer soldier of the United States, nor has it ever been. [Applause.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGGART. I will.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not the actual practice, though, and is it not true, that every Member of this House almost who comes before the Military Affairs Committee to get a record corrected uses as his principal argument the present condition of the would-be pensioner?

Mr. TAGGART. Yes; and I accept the rebuke from the gentleman, inasmuch as I went before the same Military Committee, and the gentleman with the utmost kindness listened to me and granted a favorable report in the case of a widow of a soldier with a defective record, where that widow had been reduced to poverty and the pension had been rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was good, though.

Mr. TAGGART. Yes. Now, you are going to characterize the 450,000 men who fought under this flag the same as you did that poor suffering widow who was the wife of a deserter. They are not in the same category, and they are not before this House in the same light. I am opposed to this idea of putting a penalty upon either the resources or the character,

the frugality or the industry, of a man who not only fought for the flag but made an industrious citizen afterwards. [Applause.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TAGGART. I will yield again.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the gentleman believe that one who fought for his country, as the gentleman says, in the late Civil War, should renounce his country and become a citizen of another country and still draw a pension from our Government?

Mr. TAGGART. Now, I will take the liberty of asking another question, and I will not only put it to you, but to anybody else who favors this amendment. How many pensioners on the pension roll of the United States have renounced their allegiance to the United States? Who are they, where are they, and how many of them are there? Nobody has said one word about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAGGART. For a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this amendment provide that where a man has renounced his allegiance to the United States and becomes a citizen of another country he will actually forfeit his pension?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAGGART. It all depends upon this phrase: "Or has become a citizen of a foreign country."

If that phrase is thrown in right after the main part of it, it would cut out anybody who had become a citizen of a foreign country. But I contend that the number of persons who have done that is very small.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. TAGGART. Yes; for a moment.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think the gentleman will agree that if any man who now lives abroad has rendered service to the United States, but is on the pension roll, he ought to get that pension.

Mr. TAGGART. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] says that under the present plan there is no way of telling whether he does get a pension or not, or when he dies.

Mr. TAGGART. I do not think there would be any great difficulty about that. The postal system of the United States will reach him. He signs a receipt for the pension. Here it is a question of the identification of the signature. There is no more difficulty in seeing that it reaches him than in seeing that your check might reach him, or that his banker might identify his indorsement upon that check. When he dies perhaps there might be more difficulty than if he died in the United States. But we can manage it. We have done harder things than that.

Mr. COX. Could not our foreign consuls look this matter up?

Mr. TAGGART. I imagine that if they took their heels down from the table and laid aside their cigars for awhile they could look the matter up.

This reduces a pension to a beggar's portion, and I am opposed to it; and for and in behalf of the nearly half million of men who sustained this flag I protest against it, and I will vote against it. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this same provision, in part, was before the last Congress. The last pension appropriation bill contained a provision which provided that no part of the sum appropriated in that bill for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, should be used to pay a pension to any person who resided in a foreign country or who was a citizen of a foreign country.

That provision was stricken out on a roll call in the House. That is exactly the same language that was written in the law during the second term of President Cleveland, and after it had been the law for two years Judge Lochren, a Democrat, who was administering the office of Commissioner of Pensions, wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, which I placed in the Record last year and which I will read in part now. In that letter Judge Lochren said:

A clause of chapter 187 of the public acts of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress provides:

"That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to a nonresident, who is not a citizen of the United States, except for actual disabilities incurred in the service."

I respectfully ask your attention to this clause, in the hope that you may recommend its repeal. It causes great trouble and annoyance to the excepted classes, who constitute the great bulk of nonresident pensioners, in compelling them to make proof that they belong to these excepted classes. And the final result is that payments under it are withheld from but few, save widows and dependent mothers, who have little else for their maintenance. The saving is too little to offset the suffering inflicted in individual cases. If all nonresidents were refused payments of pension some plausible argument might be made in support of such policy; but none can be urged in favor of this law, which, while giving annoyance to all, strikes only the most helpless.

I should not feel warranted in asking attention to this law but for the fact that it entails much work on this bureau, in answering communications, and seems to yield little practical results except annoyance and apparent cruelty. I recognize to the fullest extent that my sole duty is to execute and administer the laws as they are enacted—fairly and honestly interpreted.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GOOD. I regret I can not yield.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman indicate what he was reading from?

Mr. GOOD. From a copy of the letter of Judge Lochren that I read last year, and is found in the Record of February 18, 1913, page 3357. You will notice that he says no plausible argument "can be urged in favor of this law, which, while giving annoyance to all, strikes only the most helpless. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, when the call to arms came did this country ask whether the men who supported the flag and joined the Union forces in support of the Union were American citizens or citizens of Great Britain or of Ireland? And when we passed the Sherwood pension law did we ask that question? Did we ask whether or not these men who were to receive pensions were voters in the United States?

Oh, this cheap bid for votes will find no response in the hearts and minds of the 100,000,000 of our countrymen. [Applause.]

The Sherwood pension law was bottomed upon the sound principle of service. This provision, going much further than the amendment of last year, provides that no soldier, no matter where he lives, if he has an income of \$100 per month, shall receive a pension. It goes even further than that. It strikes from the pension roll every soldier living abroad who is a citizen of this country and has lived abroad for five years, no matter whether he receives his pension to-day because of wounds incurred in the line of battle or not. We have hundreds, aye, thousands of men on our pension roll to-day, some of them foreigners and some of whom live abroad, who are pensioned because of disabilities received in line of duty. This provision would prevent them from receiving a single penny in the way of a pension.

Pass this amendment, if you like, but never again say that your side of the House is in favor of pensions to the old soldiers. [Applause.] Pass this amendment, if you will, but never again on the public rostrum say that you are in favor of pensions to old soldiers for service, but say instead that you are in favor of a pension to a pauper. Place your support of pensions to old soldiers on a pauper basis, if you will, but never again refer to that bill which bears the name of that brave general who represents a constituency on the floor of this House and whose name was attached to that great bill as a service-pension bill. In the future say that it was a pension for paupers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this provision ought to be defeated by practically the unanimous membership of this body. This amendment has no place in a pension bill at this time.

Think of it! As Judge Lochren said in that report, the men and women from whom you will withhold pensions, the class who will be excluded, are the very class that need the pensions the most. True they live in other countries, where perhaps they can live more cheaply than they can in this country. As was well said by the gentleman from Missouri, many of these pensions are paid to widows living in Ireland, who gave sons or fathers to the cause of the Union. They may have become citizens of the United States and returned to their native country; and now if we adopt this amendment we shall send to them the message that they can no longer receive a pension. To the other provision of the amendment we say to the man who is frugal, the man who is industrious, but who may have given four of the best years of his life to the defense of his country,

and his country's flag, "If your income is \$1,200 a year, you can not receive one penny of a service pension."

Pass this amendment, if you will, but let it be known that it is the pension program of that side of the House, that this is the plan of Democracy as to the principle on which pensions should be granted and paid. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. On which side of the amendment does the gentleman desire to speak? All the speeches that have been made have been against it. The Chair wishes to alternate, if possible.

Mr. GRAY. I want to make a speech against this amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no pension shall be paid to any person out of this appropriation who is receiving a salary or wage in excess of \$2,000 per annum, whether paid annually, monthly, or at other periods, except such person be on the pension roll for actual disabilities received in the service; *Provided further*, That no pension shall be paid to any person out of this appropriation who is receiving or has an income other than in the last preceding proviso that amounts to more than \$2,000 per annum, or who owns property, real or personal, in excess of \$10,000, except such person be on the pension roll for actual disabilities in the service; *Provided further*, That no pension shall be paid to any person out of this appropriation who resides in a foreign country and is not a citizen of the United States, except such person be on the pension roll for actual disabilities in the service or as the widow of a soldier.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GARNER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tully, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 3432. An act to reinstate Frank Ellsworth McCorkle as a cadet at United States Military Academy.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SMOOT as the conferees on the part of the Senate:

S. 4057. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 4552. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 4352. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 4260. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 661) for the relief of the widow of Thomas B. McClintic, deceased, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, and Mr. CRAWFORD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that, in compliance with the provisions of House concurrent resolution No. 39, the Vice President had appointed Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. O'GORMAN, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. KENYON, and Mr. BRADY as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the exercises to be held in Brooklyn, N. Y., May 11, 1914, in honor of the men of the Navy and Marine Corps who lost their lives at Vera Cruz, Mexico.

PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] desire to address the committee?

Mr. BORLAND. I desire to address the committee, but if the gentleman makes a point of order I will say that this substitute is in the precise words of an amendment which was held in order on February 18, 1913, when the last pension bill was under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Without discussing that proposition, the Chair is inclined to think, in his own mind, that both are out of order; but as the Chair ruled the other in order, he will hold this also to be in order. The Chair will state that he ruled the other in order because of the precedents.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has made a very eloquent and touching speech about the widows in Ireland. I thought if we let him go long enough, either he or the gentleman from Ohio would make that speech about the widows in Ireland. Now, in this substitute I have taken care of the widows in Ireland, and not a widow in Ireland will lose her pension by virtue of this amendment. Therefore the political activity of widows in Ireland as a political asset of gentlemen in the Northern States will cease. They will no longer be a political asset to those gentlemen.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. No; not at this particular time.

Mr. GOOD. I want to ask what you have done about the voters?

Mr. BORLAND. Just at this particular moment I will not yield. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] was a member of the subcommittee which reported this pension bill two years ago, and he knows the facts which were developed at that time, that I referred to here a few minutes ago, that the amount paid to foreign pensioners had increased 300 per cent in 20 years. In 1893 it was \$350,000. It is now \$967,000, and I know that that increase is not accounted for by the widows in Ireland. I have a suspicion that a large amount of that increase is accounted for by old soldiers who have gone to western Canada and have renounced their American citizenship for the purpose of becoming homesteaders upon Canadian lands, and are now there voting in Canada. I rather suspect that we are furnishing a large amount of the living expenses of men who are trying to develop that boom country in western Canada. I undertake to say that a very large per cent of the \$967,000 has gone in that direction.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of the 5,495 pensioners, 2,879 reside in Canada.

Mr. BORLAND. More than 50 per cent of the foreign pensioners are citizens of Canada, so that the widows-in-Ireland proposition is exploded now for good. There is no more political asset in the appeal to the sentiment in favor of the widows of Ireland. It gets down to a plain proposition that you gentlemen must face on that side of the House, whether you are willing to expend the money of the American people, the money of the old soldiers who are in this country, as well as others, in the payment of pensions to men who have renounced and abandoned their country.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. The question is, Did the men who are living in Canada or any other country in the world serve the United States as soldiers during the Civil War?

Mr. BORLAND. That is not the question.

Mr. MADDEN. And have they an honorable discharge?

Mr. BORLAND. That is not the question, the gentleman who is familiar with the pension laws knows that all countries have adopted a policy to pay men who have incurred disability in the service. We have gone beyond that and we not only pay men who incur disability in the service but we pay those who are not disabled. We have gone beyond the point of disability which is the real foundation for pensions. The man who lost an arm or a leg or has shattered health or constitution from service to his country is entitled to something from his country. That is no gratuity. But when you go beyond that and pay men simply because of service, then you are doing what no civilized country has ever done or does to-day, and when you go still further and do what these gentlemen urge, take the money of your citizens to pay it to the men living abroad who are not American citizens and who have not incurred disabilities in the service, you are doing something that no country ever did and which nobody undertook to defend. It was never proposed in any legislative body in the world except this body, that pensions should be paid to men who had incurred no disability and who had renounced their flag.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am amazed at the attitude of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. Does he forget that this country is also the only great country in the world that does not constantly maintain a large standing army; but always depends in a time of emergency upon the volunteer soldier?

Many of the old soldiers who are living in Canada to-day and are drawing a small pension from the United States are men who volunteered, who offered their services and best years of their lives to their country; and if now they can better their material condition or improve it in any way by moving to Canada, the gentleman from Missouri would cut off their pensions and any recognition for the services rendered to their country.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. For a question.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his intention to remain here during the war?

Mr. TAGGART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. Would the investigation of 450,000 cases to ascertain whether or not every pensioner on the pension roll might be receiving \$2,000 a year or more, or who might have joined the Dominion of Canada and might have forfeited his pension—would not these investigations cost more than would be saved by this amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for calling my attention to that. The fact is that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri prevails it will accomplish the purpose that he has in view. It will delay the payment of pensions of more than half of the men who are to-day drawing pensions. Many of them, while they are proving that they do not receive an income of \$2,000 a year independent of their pension, will probably pass to the great beyond, while investigators for the Pension Bureau are endeavoring to find out whether they are entitled to pensions at all that the Sherwood bill intended that they should have and that all the pension laws enacted since 1862 intended they should have.

Mr. RUCKER. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. CAMPBELL. To the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BORLAND.

Mr. RUCKER. I introduced the amendment, and I do not wish to be lost sight of.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The amendment and the substitute should be defeated in the interest of just pensions to soldiers who served their country when it needed their services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have always taken very liberal ground upon this pension matter, and the district which I have the honor to represent has sustained me in that, but I have heard so often and so often of this matter of a pension certificate being a certificate of honor that I confess I have grown somewhat weary of the story. My friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], with whom upon a great many questions I am in agreement, made quite an impassioned speech upon that question and insisted that gentlemen who did not need a pension were drawing it because of the fact that it was a certificate of honor. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present what I conceive to be a certificate of honor in connection with the pension matter. During the Spanish-American War a young man went out and served as a soldier from one of the counties in the district that I have the honor to represent. He contracted disease, rheumatism, for which, when he made application, he was granted a pension. He drew that pension for some years, just how long I do not know, but when his quarterly check went to him for the quarter ending November 4, 1913, he addressed the following letter, a copy of which I hold in my hand, to the Commissioner of Pensions:

BROWNVILLE, TENN., November 10, 1913.

BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C.,

GENTLEMEN: I herewith surrender my pension, as I feel my condition is such I no longer am entitled to it. Also return last check sent me.

Yours, very truly,

W. BEN MARTIN.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I shall take the liberty of reading the reply of the Commissioner of Pensions, in order that this young man's record may appear fully. It is as follows:

NOVEMBER 18, 1913.

Mr. W. BEN MARTIN, Brownsville, Tenn.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter of the 10th instant transmitting a check for \$18 in payment of your pension certificate No. 1129432 for the quarter ending November 4, 1913, and your pension certificate. You state that your condition is such that you believe you are no longer entitled to a pension and you therefore surrender your pension certificate and the check above mentioned. In response I have to advise you that in accordance with your request the check, dated the 4th instant, for \$18 has been canceled and your name has been dropped from the pension roll.

I have examined the records in your pension case and find that you had a very creditable service from May 24, 1898, to February 13, 1899, during the War with Spain, and that you contracted rheumatism and resulting disease of the heart during the service.

I congratulate you upon the stand that you have taken. You were very patriotic enlisting in the service, and the Government had need of just such brave and loyal men as you were, and now your voluntary relinquishment of the pension is an additional evidence of your patriotism and loyalty, and entitles you to the thanks of all good men. It would be very gratifying, indeed, if everybody who is receiving a pension who honestly and conscientiously knows that it ought not to be given to them would take the same action that you have. I honor you and praise you for it.

Very truly, yours,

G. M. SALTZGABER, Commissioner.

[Applause.]

I regard that letter of Mr. Martin as a certificate of highest honor. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to war, but as long as we have war I am in favor of pensions. The average age of the soldier of the Civil War is past 70 years. His allotment of three score years and ten has more than expired. He is standing upon the verge of the grave, listening for the bugle of time to call him to the great beyond. His final summons is past due. Time has invaded his home. His family is gone, and he is alone, hovering over the cold ashes of age in the bleak winter of life. Impelled by vicissitudes, rather than choice, he has left the country for which he fought in the vigor of young manhood, to live with a son, or a daughter, or a grandchild, or to pass his few remaining days with some relative or friend of his boyhood in the land of his birth. If you ask why he does not stay in a soldiers' home, I answer, because it is not home. He would rather go back to a log house with a dirt floor and sleep on a bed of straw and live with his children, with his old-time neighbors, to be buried in his own churchyard among the graves of his family and departed friends.

I am opposed to taking away the pensions of these old soldiers. I believe that once a soldier of this Nation always a soldier of this Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to these amendments which have been offered to this bill. Without impugning the motives of anyone, or without even suggesting that my friend from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], who gratuitously assumed that I was making a political speech, was undertaking to make a political speech himself, I want to say that I do not believe this is the time to legislate upon this great question. The very fact that these two amendments which have been offered are utterly incongruous and inconsistent, and the further fact that probably there are not five Members on the floor at this time who know what the amendments provide, are sufficient reasons for me to form my conclusion that it is not wise or desirable or safe legislation in the interest of the country and of the old soldier to complicate the payment of pensions by the adoption of these amendments.

The question as to whether there ought to be any limitation as to the payment of pensions based upon the amount of income is a very grave question. I have a definite notion about that. I am of the opinion that pensions should be paid as a just obligation of the Government to its faithful and patriotic defenders, and as an honorable recognition of the services of heroic men fighting for the flag. The granting of a pension is not a gratuity, neither is it an act of charity; but no matter what I believe, or what others believe, on that proposition, I want to suggest, absolutely without partisan feeling, that it seems to me it is unwise and unfair to the old soldiers to provide that not one single dollar of the pension money appropriated in this great appropriation bill shall be paid unless it shall be ascertained that the pensioner does not have more than a certain amount of income. Neither of the distinguished gentlemen from Missouri has undertaken to provide any means whereby the amount of this income can be ascertained. Unless some means shall be provided in the law for the ascertainment of the soldier's income on pension day, all payment of pensions would be delayed indefinitely, and the old soldiers and those dependent upon them would suffer thereby. In my judgment a soldier is entitled to his pension without being compelled to make oath that he is in need. This Government can not afford to be parsimonious with the fast-disappearing army of 1861-1865.

It is stated in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] that this pension money shall not be paid on any day of payment unless the Commissioner of Pensions shall have ascertained certain facts with reference to the income of the pensioners. Now, gentlemen, stop for a moment and think. What does that mean? Under the present method of paying pensions it means, if the law is to be lived up to, that at least four times a year in some method that the gentleman from Missouri has not indicated in his amendment, and which he could not indicate in an amendment prepared hurriedly and introduced on a great appropriation bill of this kind—in some way the Commissioner of Pensions is to ascertain the monthly income of every pensioner in the country. Now, I

insist, gentlemen of the committee, that it is not a practical or just method of dealing with this question, even if the House is determined to abandon the policy which it has already decided upon, namely, that of paying pensions, not only because of wounds received or diseases incurred in the service, but because of age and length of term of service. I recognize the fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is perfectly consistent in proposing this amendment, because, as I recall, he has always strenuously and consistently opposed pension legislation based upon age and service, and I am not now questioning his motives as to that, but I am saying to those who believe in the system of paying pensions that is now upon the statute books, that was put there under the leadership of that gallant old soldier who sits across the aisle, my colleague, Gen. SHERWOOD [applause], if you believe in that system of paying pensions, it is unwise, it is unfair to the old soldiers of this country to provide in this slipshod method, in such a way that not even the author of the amendment himself can indicate, that the pension shall be held up until the commissioner shall decide the amount of the income of each pensioner. This great civil strife closed almost a half century ago; the average age of its heroic survivors is over 70 years, and they are fast passing into the great beyond; their fond recollection is the consciousness of service well performed, and a Nation's gratitude well earned. Let us not fall in appreciation at this late hour. I hope these amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee, and then the Chair hopes that the committee will be ready to vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am in favor of this amendment. I think my colleagues will agree that I have exhibited a very liberal attitude on the subject of pensions since I have been a Member of this House. As a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs that has to do with these matters I have seen that in every case where a man honestly fought for his country and by some mischance or accident had some defect in his record that did not involve moral turpitude, and where the ex-soldier needed the pension, I have always seen that that man went on the pension rolls, because I believe that a man who honestly fought for his country and honestly served his country in time of war ought to be on the pension rolls if by reason of old age or disability incurred in the service he needs help and has no independent support. But I want to call the attention of gentlemen of this committee to the remarkable figures about pensions. We pay \$169,000,000, as provided in this bill, for pensions every year. How much do you suppose that all the nations of all the earth pay their ex-soldiers? Would not you think it reasonable to suppose that all the nations of all the earth would pay to their ex-soldiers as much pensions as we pay? The fact is all the nations of all the earth pay but \$1,166,000 in pensions. We pay more than one hundred and fifty times as much as England, France, Germany, Russia, and all other nations put together pay. We actually pay to residents in Canada more money in pensions than the Government of Canada pays to its own soldiers in pensions. We pay more in any one week, nay, three times as much in a week, in pensions than all the nations of the earth pay in a year. I say we ought to be liberal toward our old soldiers, but we are carrying our liberality to an absurd extreme when we pay pensions to the rich just as we do to the needy, and to those who have expatriated themselves just as we do to our own citizens.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. We ought to be fair to them, but it does seem to me, in the interest of good government and in the interest of economy and in justice to all our people, we should draw the line somewhere, and why should not we draw that line where it will not hurt? Why not withdraw these bounties to the rich? Why not withdraw them from the aliens? If a man is drawing as much as \$2,000 a year in a salary or income, he does not need to be a pensioner upon the Government's bounty, in my humble judgment. If he is patriotic, he ought not to want a pension. If he loves his country, he ought not to measure his love in money at so much per quarter.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman says he intends to be fair in the matter of paying pensions. I notice in the appropriation bill here before the House last year, simply making appropriations to pay the pensions which the law provides, the gentleman voted against that appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true and I expect to vote against this bill. I shall vote against any bill that votes the people's money indiscriminately to those who fought for the

Union and to those who did not fight for it until years after when they saw the benefits of a pension roll.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman think that is generosity?

Mr. McKELLAR. It may not be generosity, but it is honesty. I think that is entirely fair, for this reason: I do not blame you gentlemen from the North for desiring to give liberal pensions to the deserving and needy old soldiers. I am with you in that. But, when you go further and include in your bills these enormous bounties to men in your districts, the great number of whom could have never heard the artillery roar, nor could never have seen the smoke of battle, then I am against you, for I take it, that none of us really believe that 50 years after the Civil War has closed, there are 450,000 survivors of the Union Army as shown by these pension records, which survivors are still alive. Nature does not extend their lives simply because they were in the Army. Coming from the tenth district of Tennessee, as I do, where my people are very naturally entirely opposed to pensions, which they are taxed to pay and no part of which they receive or ought to receive, I reflect their views and their wishes, as I believe, when I cast my vote against these bills.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. On the other hand, though, whenever it comes to a question of being fair to the soldier who really fought for the Union, I always vote to put him on the pension roll, for I love the Union myself, and admire the patriotism and valor of the men who fought for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee believe that such legislation as this tends to encourage the patriotism that is needed now in the face of a war with Mexico?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the gentleman, that if patriotism has fallen so low in this country that we have to pay for it in pensions, then God save our country. [Applause.] I want to say to the gentleman that in that part of the country where I come from, from that part of our land that is south of the Potomac River, where we do not receive pensions as they do in the North—

Mr. MADDEN. And where you ought not to.

Mr. McKELLAR (continuing). If we have trouble with Mexico or any other nation, you will find the young men and the old men of our Southland, where we are not paid to be patriotic but where we love our country and our flag, rising as one man to defend the flag of the Republic. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. And at the same time rise as one man to prevent the payment of pensions to the old soldiers?

Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. FESS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to close this debate in 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Move to close it now.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment shall be closed in 10 minutes, and if I do not get unanimous consent I am going to move to close debate.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] asks unanimous consent to close the debate in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] now and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to close.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I have not said anything upon the pension legislation of this House, and what I say now will not impugn the motives of anybody in expressing his opinion, either in amendments proposed to the bill or what has been said in support of amendments. The situation growing out of the Civil War, where so much bitterness was inevitable, would cause one's motives probably to be impugned if his utterances were not entirely clear when he speaks on pension matters. All I rise to say is this, that the Civil War was the greatest contest that history knows anything about between two wings of the Anglo-Saxon people, taking two distinct views of our system of Federal Government, and when it closed the most remarkably dramatic and in many ways historical event that is known in the history of civil government took place. I want to repeat to this group of men that, in my judgment, the greatest single incident in the history of civil government in the world was the successful ending of that war for the preservation of this Union. There is no doubt in the mind of any man upon either side of

this House as to that statement. It is now 49 years since that sublime scene at Appomattox took place, where the great general, the conquering hero, and leader of the forces of the Federal Army, received, in recognition of the splendid abilities of the peerless man from Virginia, the leader of the Confederate forces, not the sword, but rather the symbol of surrender. The scene was brightened when it was stated that we do not want to humiliate anybody in this country, especially a soldiery of the type of those laying down their arms. Therefore that tremendous conflict closed with less rancor between the two leaders, as well as between their followers, and I do not believe anything ought to be said upon the floor now, either on this side or on that, that would indicate that we want to revive any ill feeling between the two sides. [Applause.] All I am asking, 49 years after its close, with the average age of those who fought for the Nation's life beyond 70, when no great number can longer remain, is that we do not make any move in any way to reduce our appreciation of the men who fought in this struggle for the preservation of the Union. [Applause.]

Let us not make any change of policy at this late day. I say this not to impugn anybody's motive. I only ask Members not to run counter to their own judgment, but let the Sherwood bill stand unamended until we amend it by giving greater recognition. If such an amendment as that is proposed, I will support it. These amendments subtract. Do not take it away. [Applause.] I would not take any pension away from the man 70 years old, who leaves the United States to go into Canada, a newer country, to try to make a home there because, perhaps, there is an opportunity, or, at least, a better opportunity, up there that he has not had here because of the incentives held out to settlers. I would not take it away from him. I would not take it away from the man who, because of his ability, is enabled to draw \$100 a month, for I would not want to put our pension policy upon a pauper basis, but would want to put it on a service basis. And because he happens to be able to command a salary, I would not punish him by taking it away from him. I call upon the membership of this House in 1914, 50 years after the struggle has closed, not to start a movement to reduce our appreciation of the men who fought in this tremendous war for the Union. And that is not said in any derogation of the splendid abilities and soldierly qualities that are recognized in the men who fought on the other side of this great struggle.

I speak to my friends from the Southland and I speak to my friends from the Northland. Let us act now as if we have not forgotten the valiant services of the gallant men or lessened the appreciation that we owe to this citizenship. I hope that both of these amendments will be voted down and that we shall take no backward step in our treatment of the men who made possible the Nation as we behold it to-day, a half century later. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

[Mr. RUCKER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] may have three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] may have three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have voted, I believe, consistently against giving old-age pensions to soldiers who have renounced their allegiance to the United States. I think I shall vote for the Borland amendment, because that takes care of every soldier who was disabled in the service. I can not understand how that will do any injustice to any soldier who served during the Civil War.

I have always opposed age pensions. I said on the floor of the House when my pension bill was pending that I was in favor of a pension for service and disability. That age pension provision was put on in the Senate as a compromise. I do not believe there is any merit in being old. In two Congresses I have been the oldest man in Congress, and if there is any merit in being old or any virtue in being old then I am the most virtuous man in this Congress. [Laughter and applause.] When my pension bill was finally enacted I said I would never accept a pension under the Sherwood bill, because it pensioned a man for age, or because he was old. I never have and never will apply for a pension under that law, because I believe in making the pension roll a roll of honor, for service or disability. [Applause.] I shall support this amendment, because I do not believe that a man who thinks this country is not good enough to live in, a man who repudiates that flag that hangs above our handsome Chairman, and who swears allegiance to a foreign

country, has any business to take money out of the United States Treasury. I am in favor of taking all we can get for soldiers who still stand by the flag. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], and to that a substitute is offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. The question will first be taken on the substitute.

Mr. GORDON. Can we not have the substitute reported?

Mr. GORMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the substitute and amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The substitute offered by Mr. BORLAND was again read.

The question being taken on the substitute, on a division (demanded by Mr. BORLAND) there were—ayes 28, noes 80.

Accordingly the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the returns we have just had, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not withdraw the amendment except by unanimous consent.

Several Members objected.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. RUCKER. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15280) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BARTLETT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to file a privileged report (H. Rept. 655) of the committee appointed under House resolution 256, to investigate and report whether any Member has been guilty of violating the provisions of the criminal code by soliciting contributions for political purposes, known as the Doremus investigation, and to announce that on some day next week I will call up the matter for consideration. I file also the views of the minority and ask that both reports be printed.

The SPEAKER. The report and the views of the minority will be printed and referred to the House Calendar.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 5065. An act for the relief of Mirick Burgess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1703. An act for the relief of George P. Chandler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1086. An act for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 5066. An act to increase the authorization for a public building at Osage City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution providing for method of improving channels giving access to military reservations or fortifications; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to authorize the President to grant leave of absence to an officer of the Corps of Engineers for the purpose of accepting an appointment under the Govern-

ment of China on works of conservation and public improvement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WILLIAM T. GRADY—LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William T. Grady, Sixty-third Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DETTRICK, for 10 days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, May 11, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of War, submitting estimates of deficiency in appropriations required by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 970), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8593) amending the building regulations of the District of Columbia by providing for the better protection of persons engaged in and about the construction, repairing, alterations, or removal of buildings, bridges, viaducts, and other structures, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 649), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DUNN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13611) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to disregard the provision contained in the public-building act approved March 4, 1913, requiring open space for fire protection about the proposed Federal building at Salisbury, Md., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 650), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARLIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 163) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 652), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 653), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 485) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 654), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16358) for the relief of Abraham Kauffmann, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 651), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 16413) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Crockett, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 16414) providing for a military highway between the Government arsenal at Augusta, Ga., and the Government fort at Fort Screven, Tybee Island, Ga., by way of the Old Stockade in Jenkins County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 16415) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of condemned cannon and cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 16416) to provide for recognizing the services of certain officers of the Army and Navy, late members of the Isthmian Canal Commission, by extending to them the thanks of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POST: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) relating to the awards and payments thereon in what is commonly known as the Plaza cases; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 16417) granting an increase of pension to James Edward Dare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16418) granting an increase of pension to Adam Forney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 16419) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16420) granting an increase of pension to Artamina Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 16421) granting an increase of pension to Missoura A. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16422) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16423) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16424) for the relief of Lloyd C. Stark; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 16425) for the relief of the Schwarzschild & Sulzberger Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 16426) granting a pension to Harry S. Comrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 16427) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILMORE: A bill (H. R. 16428) granting a pension to Thomas J. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16429) for the relief of the estate of Richard Brown, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KEISTER: A bill (H. R. 16430) for the relief of John Oursler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 16431) to validate the homestead entry of William H. Miller; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16432) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hockinbery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 16433) granting a pension to Edward J. Glennon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16434) granting an increase of pension to Levi Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16435) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 16436) granting an increase of pension to David R. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16437) granting an increase of pension to James W. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 16438) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Dolph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 16439) granting an increase of pension to Nelson J. Letts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of Redondo Beach, Cal.; Roberts, Ill.; Middletown, N. Y.; and Indianapolis, Ind., against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the city council of New Orleans, La., favoring Hamill bill (H. R. 5139) to pension postal employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. AIKEN: Resolutions of a Democratic convention of Anderson County, S. C., indorsing administration of President Wilson; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, and other citizens of Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Coshocton (Ohio) Glass Co., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petitions of A. J. Bird, J. S. Oakes, F. G. Kellar, Ira King, Walter Furl, D. W. Dietz, V. G. Bowman, R. H. Hammer, L. D. Miller, C. W. Shaffer, F. H. Randle, Daniel Statler, M. L. Rankin, J. R. Keeler, W. E. Oldham, M. W. Shaffer, John Hitzshew, D. B. Kring, W. B. Benson, W. A. Blough, H. V. Eppley, J. S. Mosholder, J. H. Kring, J. S. Long, Jacob Esterly, Solomon Kimmel, C. S. Mishler, C. E. Thomas, E. T. Grubb, George Wentz, David G. Evans, Henry Blum, J. T. Glesmer, B. E. Slick, Homer Blanset, R. W. Mardis, Frank Harbaugh, S. R. Cullis, W. H. Queer, M. W. Swabb, H. M. Heinze, J. C. Hildebrand, A. L. Hildebrand, J. W. Heinze, E. T. Heffley, A. C. Ahlborn, George Boxerdale, Charles A. Manges, T. J. Hughes, E. E. Hickler, George Brown, F. E. Cooper, J. W. Schnabel, T. B. Dixon, George P. Bauer, J. F. Leese, C. E. Frank, S. J. Davis, Alex Hofecker, E. P. Ditzeler, M. S. Edwards, C. M. Gill, Anderson Wertz, J. W. Harshberger, Jacob Wingard, Lee Wingard, J. D. Strayer, S. N. Carpenter, F. B. Kinzey, H. H. Bolden, Cecil Criller, Benoni Kauffman, H. F. Heffley, Henry Grush, W. H. C. Sprengle, Lewis Weaver, John Dignan, F. L. Wilson, Harry Wolfard, A. M. Wilson, R. W. Wallace, John Phillips, J. A. Atkinson, William K. Moore, Gabriel Klue, Henry Lenhart, D. S. Wilson, S. D. Bracken, G. Collins, E. B. Stockberger, Jacob Wallace, J. C. Neff, L. S. Berkey, H. L. Berkey, N. L. Boyts, George Hofecker, Joseph Kantner, William J. Pifer, H. W. Manges, H. M. Shaver, C. H. Kieffer, George W. Shaver, Daniel Snaveley, S. A. Whyte, George Moyer, H. S. Slick, William H. Shaver, R. W. Horner, Edgar Bentley, H. H. Weimer, G. H. Wolfe, R. O. Miller, R. E. Boyt, Robert Stephens, W. L. Kauffman, all of Johnstown, Pa., for passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request): Petitions of Brice Sell, F. A. Langham, J. U. Benton, J. A. Sell, Fred Benton, Simon Sell, Martin S. Greenleaf, D. D. Sell, C. L. Anderson, Leo Schilling, J. H. Harker, John Sell, T. A. Sell, S. A. Sell, Mrs. Fred Benton, Mrs. J. U. Benton, Mathew Sell, Amelia Benton, Mary Benton, Mrs. A. Water, Ruth E. Benton, Mary Sell, Mrs. Luke Bowser, Chester Langham, Sara M. Langham, Mrs. James A. Sell, Mrs. C. R. Allen, Mrs. Brice Sell, Mrs. Jennie Sell, Mrs. David Beck, Arvilla Sell, Edna Anderson, Mrs. Minnie Baker, Harry Baker, Emory Langham, Mrs. F. A. Langham, Essington Bowser, Mrs. Sarah E. Allison, Mrs. Margaret Feichter, Mrs. Clara Sell, all of Hollidaysburg; Jerry Snowberger, Ira Snowberger, A. L. Miller, Archie Claar, Burdine Claar, E. H. Claar, Grant Snowberger, Sue Keagy, H. D. King, Mrs. H. S. King, Gary Ruggles, Florine Snowberger, Louis Holland, Luke Bowser, Marella Snowberger, Rachel R. Claar, Florine Claar, E. R. Zeigler, Jennie R. Zeigler, Mrs. George Zeigler, Pearl Miller, Elmer Zeigler, all of East Freedom; also, J. M. Greenleaf, Anthony Walters, J. H. De Haas, Mrs. Elizabeth Wineland, Mrs. J. M. Greenleaf, Bertha Greenleaf, Anna Greenleaf, Harriet M. McGraw, all of McKee; also, F. A. Bowser, James W. Hammel, Mrs. James Hammel, Mrs. Laura Wyant, Mrs. Grover Diehl, Mrs. Bertha Hammel, Miss Laura Hammel, all of Newry; also, Ethel A. Manges, of Roaring Spring; Mrs. Laura Hoover, of Brooks Mills; and William B. Singer, of Lamersville; H. G. King, Mrs. Grant Snowberger, East Freedom; all in the State of Pennsylvania, for passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition.

Also, petitions of White, Hentz & Co., of Philadelphia; John Finn, of South Fork; and J. V. Leonard, of Gallitzin, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Spangler Branch of the William A. Sunday Antiliquor Association and the Men's Club of the Spangler Presbyterian Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Union, No. 146, United Mine Workers of America, of Hopewell, Pa., favoring Government intervention in mining district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petition of sundry citizens of Laporte, Michigan City, South Bend, Rochester, Lapaz, Akron, Mishawaka, Hamlet, Elkhart, Knox, and other cities in the State of Indiana, in opposition to Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petitions of sundry citizens of Barberton; the Methodist Episcopal Church and citizens of Akron, Ohio; and the Second Christian Church of Warren, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various officers of the Political Equality Club of Warren and Jefferson Suffrage League, of Ashtabula, Ohio, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Petition of the First Methodist Church of Dallas, Tex., favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dallas, Tex., favoring House bill 12928, to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dallas, Tex., and Dallas County, Tex., against Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of 330 citizens of Camden, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 42 citizens of Gloucester County and 13 citizens of Swedesboro and Bridgeport, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of Hebrew-American Typographical Union No. 83, International Typographical Union, relative to the Bartlett-Bacon bill (H. R. 1873); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 146 voters of the twenty-second New York congressional district, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of John Kohn, William Peterson, H. Macklaff, F. Winknetz, F. Wans, Thomas Rymers, Joseph Sheaffer, August Haas, Frank Koenig, H. Guertkon, George Bingham, Adolph Wilde, Herman Deedrich, Paul Luepke, Robert Oberdas, J. Myruck, F. Hoenig, William Engle, M. Twoka, Anton Worzala, H. Krokea, T. Troker, S. Stamevehski, and M. Zermuramy, all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50 or any other prohibition measures which tend to prohibit the manufacturer, sale, shipment, or importation of any kind of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Brewers' Association and sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of F. Hurdy, Edward Price, F. H. Fowles, E. J. Scott, Henry P. Bryant, Julia Punt, E. L. Ingham, John Stark, Ruth Bayless, Christine Bryant, Silas Williams, J. Ingold, Maye Robertson, Otis J. Hunt, and Forbes H. Brown, all of Vallejo, Cal., to submit amendment prohibiting importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition by the Farmers & Merchants Bank, of Stockton; P. E. Platt, of Stockton; the Union Safe Deposit Bank, of Stockton; the members of the Grain Trades Association of California; R. B. Teefy, for the San Joaquin Valley Bank, of Stockton; the governing board, associate membership of the Knights of the Royal Arch; German-American League of California, all of the State of California, against the passage of the Hobson national constitutional prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of E. E. Bennett, Martin Wing, G. H. Armstrong, E. La Montagues, all of New York City, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens of Fort Pierre, S. Dak., favoring women's suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON: Petition of 24 voting citizens and the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Dupont; 50 citizens of Free-town; 150 citizens of Madison; 50 citizens of Moores Hill; 19 citizens of Seymour; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union

of Dearborn; and 36 citizens of Decatur County, all of the State of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of sundry citizens of East Robertson, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the New York Peace Society, approving mediation to prevent war with Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Racine Civics Study Class, urging passage of the Bristow-Mondell resolution relative to franchise for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON: Petitions of J. T. Lewis, R. R. Wilson, and 34 other citizens of Jordan, House, Portales, and McAllister; Earl E. Forbes, J. J. Basden, and 43 other citizens of Clovis; Mrs. R. R. Yelland, B. H. Porter, Dr. R. D. Holt, and 26 other citizens of Espanola; W. S. Gilliam, E. L. Forgason, and 41 other citizens of Mesilla Park; the Sunday School Convention, signed by its presiding officer, W. J. Morgan, of McAllister, all in the State of New Mexico, for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Matias Romero, Pablo Martinez, and 10 other citizens of San Marcial and Clyde, N. Mex., favoring the passage of House bill 12929, including section 6 thereof, to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Matias Romero and 21 other citizens of San Marcial, Clyde, and San Antonio, N. Mex., protesting against the enactment of legislation closing the barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of W. P. Riley, Hon. Eugene L. Brewer, Hon. E. M. Teel, and 37 other citizens of Hope, N. Mex., and vicinity, favoring the enactment of legislation establishing a national flexible currency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Union Church, representing 100 people, of Fort Sumner; a singing school, representing 20 people, of Melrose; a citizens' meeting, representing 125 people, of Taiban; a mass meeting, representing 400 people, of Las Vegas; a meeting of cattlemen and ranchmen, representing 25 people, of Mineral Hill; the East Mora County Bible School Association, representing 272 people, of Roy; the Liberty Sunday School, representing 32 people, of Roy; the Methodist Episcopal Church, representing 300 people, of Las Cruces; the Presbyterian Church, representing 100 people, of Las Cruces, all in the State of New Mexico, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERRIS: Petition of the working class of Chickasha, Okla., relative to intervention by the Government in mining trouble of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Petition of sundry citizens of Prescott, Ark., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of various voters of the second congressional district of Pennsylvania; M. A. Jackson and E. M. Slappeler, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various voters of Port Royal and the Presbyterian Church of Port Royal, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Manufacturers' Association of Erie, Pa., relative to bills to regulate the conduct of interstate business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of Elfrido Ara and 48 other residents of Pirtleville, Ariz., in favor of the Lindquist pure-fabric law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Josiah Fike and 20 other citizens, of J. W. Owen Post, No. 5, Grand Army of the Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., against changing United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 115 citizens of Prescott, Ariz., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of H. F. Courter and 12 other citizens of Solomonville, Ariz., favoring House bill 12928, to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Thatcher, Ariz., favoring equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of H. F. Courter and 14 other residents of Solomonville, Ariz., against the passage of House bill 7826, a bill to provide for closing barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of various voters of the twelfth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL: Thirty-four telegrams from Charles H. Smith, H. Buchmiller, A. L. Brewer, T. H. Carr, Robert L. Proudfit, James Pingree, Last & Thomas, A. P. Biglow, Ogden Wholesale Drug Co., Murphy Hardy Co., A. R. McIntyre, J. L. Carlson, J. N. Spargo, Dr. C. F. Osgood, C. J. Humphries, T. D. Ryan, F. Fouts, George McCormick, W. H. Harris, H. M. Rowe, Patrick Healy, G. H. Tribe & Co., Ogden City Ice Co., W. B. Porterfield, M. S. Browning, J. W. Abbot, Joseph Scowcroft, Union Portland Cement Co., Buchmiller & Flower, Thomas G. Burt, W. H. Chevers, A. M. Miller, Frank J. Stevens, and David Mattson, all of Ogden, Utah, protesting against national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various churches representing 680 citizens of Salt Lake City, 272 citizens of Ogden, 50 citizens of Garland, 105 citizens of Tremonton, 23 citizens of Ferron, 50 citizens of Logan, 16 citizens of Delta, 26 citizens of Richfield, 65 citizens of Moab, and 21 citizens of Ephraim, all in the State of Utah, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petition of 18 citizens of Oil City, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the First Presbyterian Sunday School, Ridgway, representing 250 persons; the Christian Endeavor Society, Ridgway, representing 40 persons; the Ridgway Free Methodist Church, Ridgway, representing 40 persons; the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Ridgway, representing 800 persons; the Ridgway Presbyterian Missionary Society, Ridgway, representing 30 persons; the Woman's Home Missionary Society, Ridgway, representing 56 persons; the Epworth League of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Ridgway, representing 43 persons; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Youngville, representing 62 persons; the Missionary Society, Second Presbyterian Church, Oil City, representing 90 persons; the Children's Aid Society, Oil City, representing 75 persons; and the Trinity Sunday School, Spartansburg, representing 19 citizens, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring House resolution 168, the Hobson resolution, for national prohibition by Federal amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by 109 voters of Grove City, Mercer County, Pa., in favor of the national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various churches representing 21 citizens of Seattle, 100 citizens of Mount Vernon, 30 citizens of Friday Harbor, 55 citizens of Renton, 35 citizens of Belleville, and 60 citizens of Allen, all in the State of Washington, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of the J. B. Sickles Saddlery Co. and the P. K. Engineers of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of 120 citizens of Mount Pleasant, 55 citizens of Irwin, 83 citizens of Scottsdale, and sundry citizens of Slippery Rock, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Slippery Rock, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINDEL: Petition of sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., favoring House bill 12928, to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Denver and Fort Lupton, Colo., protesting against passage of the Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Colorado and sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petitions of F. L. Westerfield, T. J. Mallory, and sundry citizens of the eighth congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KONOP: Memorial of the University Club; the Racine Suffrage Association, of Racine; and sundry citizens of Peshtigo, all in the State of Wisconsin, relative to franchise for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Carl Fredrickson and others, of Athelstone, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Equal Franchise League, of New Britain, Conn., favoring the passage of the Bristow-

Mondell resolution enfranchising women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of 305 citizens of Ulster County, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOY: Petitions of 4,885 citizens of the ninth congressional district of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 3,000 citizens of Essex County, N. J., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Essex County, N. J., and other cities of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various banks of Newark, N. J., favoring amendment to income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petitions and resolutions of the Eaton Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, of Livermore Falls; the Hannibal Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Lewiston; the Park Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Lewiston; the High Street Congregational Church, of Auburn; East Hebron Grange, No. 300, of Turner; Advance Lodge, No. 10, Independent Order of Good Templars, of South Lewiston; and sundry citizens of East Hebron and Livermore Falls, all of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of various churches and organizations, representing 1,071 citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirty-second congressional district of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Three Mile Bay, Philadelphia, and Earlville, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Petitions of the West Milford Methodist Episcopal Church, of West Milford; the Duff Street Sunday School; the Sycamore Methodist Episcopal Church; the Coburns Creek Methodist Episcopal Church; the St. Paul's Sunday School; the First Methodist Episcopal Sunday School; the First Presbyterian Sunday School; the St. Mark's Evangelical Lutheran Sunday School; the First Baptist Sunday School; and the Christian Church Sunday School, all of Clarksburg, W. Va., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Darlington, Wis., and Grant County, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the third congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring woman suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3993, relative to appropriation for new buildings for marine hospital at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry citizens of Athol, Mass., favoring passage of House bill 12923, retaining section 6; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Athol and Petersham, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 400 citizens of Lawrence, 100 citizens of Winchester, and 150 citizens of Reading, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POST: Petitions of sundry citizens of Piqua, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: Petitions of 500 men and women of Reno, Nev., favoring Bristow-Mondell constitutional amendment for woman's suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Middlesex County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petitions of various churches representing 529 citizens of Pueblo, 30 citizens of Steamboat Springs, 100 citizens of Fowler, and sundry citizens of Bayfield, all in the State of Colorado, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Denver Convention Association against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELLS: Petition of 326 citizens of Tazewell, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of 2,991 voters of the fifth district of Wisconsin, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution adopted by the St. Paul Turnverein Society, of St. Paul, Minn., urging passage of the Hamill bill, providing pensions for aged employees of the Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of Joseph L. Haas, president of the Municipal League of Rock Island County, Rock Island, Ill., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Victor Roderick, of La Harpe, Ill., favoring Stevens bill (H. R. 13305) relative to standardization of prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH: Petition of 2,839 citizens of the fourth congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Mrs. I. Ernsberger, of Ada, Ohio, and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the adoption of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Martha McCarty, of Delaware, Ohio, and other members of the Delaware County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the adoption of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John N. Schirmer, of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Barney Schleper, of Findlay, Ohio, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Joseph A. Schmitt, of Bedford, Ohio, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. M. Hickernell, of Ada, Ohio, and other members of the Women's Home Missionary Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, urging the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Emerson Ritter, of Cable, Ohio, representing 40 members of the Mount Carmel Christian Endeavor, urging the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 3,000 citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 11, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, we thank Thee for the spirit of patriotism which obtains in the hearts of our people, that to-day the tears of a Nation will mingle with the tears of those bereft of their dear ones, who died upholding the honor and dignity of the flag which we cherish as the emblem of all that we hold sacred. The Nation honors itself in honoring its precious dead, and while she thus cares for her defenders she will not want for patriots in peace or in war. Be with, we beseech Thee, the stricken and torn hearts in this hour of sorrow. May they look to a bright beyond, where the true, the brave, self-sacrificing find a glorious reward. Peace be to their ashes, and joy ineffable to their souls as they go marching on, and everlasting praise be Thine. In the name of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.